DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 304 HE 005 097

TITLE	Monographs on Music in Higher Education. Papers and Reports from Conferences Sponsored by the Contemporary Music Project.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Schools of Music, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	88p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; Conference Reports; Curriculum Development; *Graduate Study; *Higher Education; *Music Activities; *Music Education; *Music Teachers

ABSTRACT

The papers contained in the first section of this publication were prepared as background material for a Contemporary Music Project (CMP) Conference on College Music Curricula held in October 1970. The papers concern musical analysis and evaluative competence, compositional processes and writing skills, music history and literature, performance and applied music skills, and the musician as teacher. Conference proceedings for invitational forums held at Yale University, April 1973 and at Northwestern University, January 1973 are presented. These proceedings covered the education of the performing musician and the graduate education of college music teachers respectively. (MJM)

ED 069304
8304

NASM

national association of schools of music

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Ware
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

MONOGRAPHS ON MUSIC IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Conference on
COLLEGE MUSIC
CURRICULA
Airlie House, 1970

Invitational Forum on
THE EDUCATION OF THE
PERFORMING MUSICIAN
Yale University, 1973

Invitational Forum on
THE GRADUATE
EDUCATION OF
COLLEGE MUSIC
TEACHERS
Northwestern University, 1973

HE 005 097

ED 088304

Monographs on
MUSIC in HIGHER EDUCATION

Papers and Reports from Conferences
Sponsored by the
Contemporary Music Project

Conference on

COLLEGE MUSIC CURRICULA
Airlie House, 1970

Invitational Forum on

THE EDUCATION OF THE PERFORMING MUSICIAN
Yale University, 1973

Invitational Forum on

THE GRADUATE EDUCATION OF COLLEGE MUSIC TEACHERS
Northwestern University, 1973

No. 1 of a series published by

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
SUITE 650, ONE DUPONT CIRCLE, WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

Copyright © 1973

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

All rights reserved including the right to reproduce
this book or parts thereof in any form.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION v
Robert J. Werner

CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE MUSIC CURRICULA 1

Background Papers:

MUSICAL ANALYSIS AND EVALUATIVE COMPETENCE 2
William Thomson

COMPOSITIONAL PROCESSES AND WRITING SKILLS .. 9
Warren Benson

MUSIC HISTORY AND LITERATURE 14
William J. Mitchell

PERFORMANCE AND APPLIED MUSIC SKILLS 19
Samuel Adler

THE MUSICIAN AS TEACHER 25
Robert Klotman

THE EDUCATION OF THE PERFORMING MUSICIAN 31

Report of an Invitational Forum held at
Yale University, April 1973

Contents 33

THE GRADUATE EDUCATION OF COLLEGE
MUSIC TEACHERS 57

Report of an Invitational Forum held at
Northwestern University, January 1973

Contents 59

Agenda 35

Participants 36

Introduction 38

Statement of Purpose — Plenary Session I 39

The Education of the Performing Musician
Lucien Wulsin 39

The Increasing Demand for Versatility — Plenary Session II 44
Professional Internships in the Arts — Plenary Session III 45
Discussions and Recommendations 46
Discussion Groups A 47
B 48
C 50
D 52
Summary 54
Agenda 61
Participants 62
Introduction 64
Forum Papers
Current Status of Graduate Programs and the Need for More Versatility in Graduate Studies — Himie Voxman 65
NASM Basic Musicianship Statement 68
Implications of the NASM Basic Musicianship Statement for the Preparation of College Teachers — Robert Glidden 69
The Administrator's Role in the Reorientation and Utilization of Faculty — Robert M. Trotter 73
The Role of the Music Administrator — Eugene Bonelli 77
Discussion and Recommendations 80
An Expanded View of Specialization 80
Attitudes Toward Teaching 81
Graduate Programs 82
Evaluation 83
Summary 84

INTRODUCTION

This publication is a fitting capstone to the activities of the Contemporary Music Project. It includes suggestions by individuals on the application of comprehensive musicianship in music studies and recommendations of two national meetings regarding specific curricular programs.

It is also appropriate that this monograph is published by the National Association of Schools of Music. The content of these papers is supportive of NASM's efforts to assure the highest professional standards in the preparation of musicians while continually encouraging its members and others to provide students with a professional education that is responsive to the demands and potential of today's society. The professional relationship between the Project and the Association is a fine example of organizational and personal concern that has been the hallmark of our schools and departments of music who have been aware of the need for high standards and continuing evaluation.

The papers contained in the first section of this publication were prepared as background material for a CMP Conference on College Music Curricula held in October 1970. This Conference brought together a select group of music administrators to discuss with representatives of the Project administration and Policy Committee, various professional organizations, and government agencies the course that CMP might take to implement the concept of comprehensive musicianship. This meeting was an example of the "umbrella effect" that CMP represented within the profession in that a wide variety of professional interests were represented by those invited as they considered mutual problems and hopes, and anticipated procedures for the future.

The music administrators were invited to this Conference to emphasize their important position as catalysts for developing dialogue in their local situations and for providing leadership in implementing new curricular ideas. The background papers were prepared in advance and sent to these administrators to share with their faculties and to discuss their implications as background for discussion. The papers are presented here for the same reason — to provide stimulating ideas that could be the basis for consideration by both curriculum committees and faculty in general.

It is interesting to compare these papers with the reports and recommendations of the two national Forums held two and a half years later. The background of each is given in its own introduction. The reader will sense the growing concern for developing a professional curriculum that is more responsive to the needs of the contemporary musician.

It is the sincere hope of the Project and its administration that this publication, an example of the curricular efforts of CMP over the past fourteen years, will contribute to the quest for a more comprehensive musicianship.

ROBERT J. WERNER, *Director*
Contemporary Music Project

CONTEMPORARY MUSIC PROJECT
CONFERENCE ON
COLLEGE MUSIC CURRICULA

Background Papers

AIRLIE HOUSE
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA
OCTOBER 28–31, 1970

Musical Analysis and Evaluative Competence

WILLIAM THOMSON

Let us first be clear on what we mean by analysis. We do not mean any particular analytical technique such as those developed by Rameau, Hindemith, or Schenker. We are concerned, rather, with the act of taking a whole musical statement, whether it be an entire work or only a complete segment, and reducing that whole to its manifold patterns in order to understand the nature of its parts and the ways they relate one to another to form *structure*. This process of razing and relating can attend to every perceptual level from the unit of the isolated tone to the gross units of form.

Musicians analyze musical compositions for much the same reasons gourmets analyze foods: the better to savor the mixture with the highest possible degree of satisfaction; as a means for comparing the characteristics of a present experience to past or future experiences; and sometimes even in order to recreate the same or a similar concoction. As with gourmets, musicians perform their analytical feats with varying degrees of finesse.

The objective of training in analysis during the musician's early formative years is to develop within him psychological sets that render him capable of apprehending and comprehending the music he encounters. "Were the eye not attuned to the sun," wrote Goethe, "the sun would never be seen by it." It is the job of practice in analysis to attune the human consciousness to the total potentials of the musical experience.

During the past decade attention has been focused on analysis primarily within the closed gates of the theorists' camp. It is difficult to pick up a learned journal these days in which some composer's work is not publicly dismembered and displayed as a compound of many parts. An unfortunate by-product of theorists' recent enthusiasm for this sort of thing has been the growing assumption among the rest of the musical community that only theorists analyze. In fact it is believed in some quarters that analysis can occur only in college music courses which bear Analysis as a part of their titles. (If not Analysis, at least Theory!)

One of the wholesome attitudes fostered by the ideal of comprehensive musicianship is that analysis is relevant — or let us even say *essential* — to any act of music making that rises above the purely intuitive or rote level. The wise pianist analyzes before he attempts to sightread a new piece, for he otherwise cannot make parts relate one to another or any single part relate to the whole; his knowing *where this part goes* enables him even to make *this part* a coherent unit on its own. The composer who cannot rethink his own work (or another composer's work) in terms of part-whole relationships risks making music that is uncontrolled and lacks the inherent logic formed by effective music. The singer who has not gained insight into the way his line meshes with the whole tonal fabric labors under a hardship

that would repel an automobile mechanic in his work. And the listener — who is all of us — is left with vague generalizing in his attempts to evaluate what he hears unless he can pin his experience to objective events and relationships in order to explicate the way in which these mold the work.

Analysis in the Curriculum Today

Within the immediate tradition of college music education, analysis has been centered in courses which carry titles such as "Form and Analysis," "Style Analysis," or some derivative of these two root titles. These courses normally occur as a part of the undergraduate's curriculum during the third year following the limited analytical work that may have been done as an adjunct to the study of harmony during the first two years' study. Although any generalizations about the substantive content of such courses must be made with caution, three major criticisms can be made with justification about their effectiveness in preparing students to deal with the music they may hear, see, perform, or compose within their future lives.

First, these courses confine their analytical tinkerings to paltry samplings of music. Sometimes the repertory is drawn from the so-called "period of common practice." Too often even this range is further attenuated to include only Beethoven sonatas, Mozart quartets and sonatas, the chorale harmonizations of J. S. Bach, or some other circumscribed body of literature for which stereotyped analytical paradigms are available.

The underlying assumption of analysis classes has been, we must infer, that a singular musical repertoire can provide sufficient basis for the understanding of *all music,* that having unravelled a few of the syntactic complexities of Bach, Mozart, or Beethoven automatically imparts to the student the perspective and acumen required to unravel *any* piece of music. This assumption is neither pedagogically sound nor does it spring from a reasonable understanding of the nature of music. That it does not produce desired behaviors in graduates of our music schools can be verified by their inability, by and large, to apprehend and meaningfully discuss a work heard for the first time that was composed during an era earlier or later than the period of common practice. (I mean an appraisal and discussion *of the music*, not a mere identification of the probable composer or period.)

Second, the analytical focus of these courses, whatever the cadavers selected for dissection, is too exclusive. For the most part musical form is viewed as the product of thematic events, and harmony is regarded as a domain of tertial sonorities cohabiting within the fences of the eternal dominant-tonic relationship.

Yet, after the most detailed analysis of functional harmony in Beethoven, a student cannot be expected to understand the harmonic language of a vast part of the music written in our own century. He is left with no paradigms of structure by which he can conceptualize events in any music within which the concepts of tertial harmony and a tonal axis are irrelevant. Similarly the most diligent probing into the thematic gambols of 18th- and

19th-century music cannot adequately prepare the student for an understanding of organization in Bartok quartets, Hindemith sonatas, or a Penderecki oratorio. When a highly restrictive set of exemplars is utilized in establishing norms, works which veer wide of those norms must be regarded as eccentric, when they may in fact represent other, equally valid, norms. The more deeply the student is immersed in the music of a single-style period, the more he is persuaded to accept that music as normative for all musics, and thus his vision is blurred rather than sharpened.

And third, analysis is undertaken in these courses as a purely visual matter, or listening occurs only as a court of final appeal once visual data have been combined thoroughly. To analyze, it is implied, one looks at notes on paper. That the data of analysis might be filtered through the ear rather than the eye seems to be an eccentric notion peculiar to non-academic types.

Needed Changes in the Teaching of Analysis

The viewpoint of comprehensive musicianship is not consonant with these entrenched foibles of tradition. A healthier cultivation of the analytic faculty entails attention to many different kinds of music, from a sampling of cultures, eras, and social strata that is as broad as can be accommodated by the vision of the teacher. This does not mean that one is merely to look casually into a scattering of all kinds of music — a little Haydn, a bit of Webern, a smattering of Gregorian chant, and a brace of songs from *Kismet*. It means on the contrary that strategies of analysis must be drawn from the premise that *all musics of all times possess some common elements (or parameters) and processes* and that stylistic uniqueness is manifested by an individual piece of music in terms of how it does or does not incorporate these various elements and processes, their peculiar nature, and their interaction and relative domination of the musical substance. It thus appears that effective analytical training must proceed from the recognition of a set of basic properties (melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre, texture, form) and elemental processes. Analytic perusal then is directed toward understanding the nature of these elements and processes and the ways they are conjoined to create a musical statement. All music becomes fair game for penetrating analytical attention. The broader the sampling, the more probable an understanding of the essential musical basis.

This means that a single set of analytical categories can be used to guide the student through the analysis of a Bulgarian folk song as well as a Gregorian chant or a Haydn Minuette, a current jazz improvisation as well as a Japanese Gagaku or a Davidovsky tape piece. It means in essence a tearing away of the shackles of obsolete stereotypes of musical structure which inhibit rather than nourish musical understanding. It forces attention on *all* of those potentially musical properties and processes which can determine musical structure.

Warren Benson made clear the need for broadening the analytical base in his report on the Interlochen Arts Academy Pilot Project.[1] He noted there that his students once developed the following listing of what we might call "form-causes" for the Villa-Lobos *Bachianas Brasileiras No. 5:*

Form	A	B	A
Orchestra	Pizzicato	Arco	Pizzicato
	Staggered entrance	Concerted	Staggered
	Thin texture	Thick	Thin
	Relaxed	Intense	Relaxed
	Consonant	Dissonant	Consonant
Voice	Vocalise	Recitative	Vocalise
	Rising line	Falling line	Rising line
	Even rhythm	Uneven	Even
	Lyric	Dramatic	Lyric

He adds that "If they had learned that form is dependent on key relationships, these observations would not refute the point. They might however have broadened it."

But perhaps the most crucial need is to gradually impress upon the analytical format a structured concern for aural analysis. Music is an aural art. It is not a collection of printed artifacts, for the score is a mere denotative approximation of the real musical thing. Why then, should not the analytical act also be practiced as an aural process: *heard tones* replacing *seen notes*? In this way the score becomes an adjunct to analysis rather than an exclusive document of evidence (which becomes nonsensical when dealing with most tape music or any piece in which extended improvisation occurs). Two processes are essential for the musician: 1) the ability to sort out of the aural perception those foreground-background interplays which form the musical experience; and 2) the ability to look at a score and, through an act of aural imagery, extract a sense of musical order. In view of these related yet distinct needs, it should be clear that analytical training cannot be confined to printed scores.

Analysis in the Curriculum of the Future

Changing the wine demands some attention to the design of the bottles. For this reason we must not only consider the objects we use for our analyses and the strategies of our analytical processes, but we must also think in terms of where and how analysis takes place within the curriculum. Certainly the block succession of courses, consisting of "Rudiments" (or "Skills"), "Harmony," "Counterpoint," and, at last, "Analysis," is ineffec-

[1]Warren Benson, *Creative Projects in Musicianship* (Washington: Music Educators National Conference, 1967), pp. 45-46.

tive. This neat compartmentalization of the learning process lacks any correspondence with musical reality, and it forces a shambling gait on the learning succession.

Analysis must be regarded as a necessary adjunct to all music learning, beginning as soon as the student is engaged in conceptual responses to music. The third grader's recognition of contour in a melody is an analytical act; the beginning pianist's awareness of triadic outlines in the melody he tries to coax from the keys represents analysis as much as the mature theorist's reduction of a Beethoven movement to an *Ursatz*. Only a matter of degree separates the two. Analysis is part and parcel of any teaching of music that is not solely a rote process.

Clearly then analysis cannot be reserved as a separate course in the college curriculum. It must occur as an integral part of the whole teaching scheme in the theory class, certainly, but also in the private lesson, ensemble rehearsal, music history class, and in any other instructive context. What is needed is a sense of perspective to replace the narrow compartmentalization that has bogged music learning down in one tiny puddle of man's musical past, a state that renders the student incapable of transferring what he learns in his analysis course to his encounters with a variety of musics in the real world of music making. For the theory class proper this means that "Form and Analysis" cannot be relegated to a third year of study that follows a detailed study of rudimentary harmony. Doing this is tantamount to studying the art of bricklaying without any concern for what walls look like.

It appears that the day of the total separation in the undergraduate basic curriculum[2] of music literature and music theory is fading. The separation was established during a day when we were more concerned about maintaining the integrity of our own little domains than in the learning success of our students. (After all "music lit" is taught by musicologists and "theory" is taught by theorists or composers!) If we reconsider educational goals, it seems evident that there is no intrinsic value in learning particular pieces of music merely because they exist and might be revered as *masterpieces*. And there is no known value for learning about augmented sixth chords (German, French, Italian or Belgian!) unless one immediately relates this information to its experiential function within a real musical context.

Those of us who have been intimately involved in the work of the Contemporary Music Project over the past decade have concluded that essential reform involves a tight correlation of the analytical, aural, and written work done in the theory class with studies of repertory undertaken in the undergraduate music literature course and, even, the private studio. In some of our experimental programs this has been planned as a single

[2]I refer here only to the music literature survey course that is required by many schools during the first or second year of the music-major curriculum.

class with a single instructor, there being an alternation of emphasis between repertory and historical setting (particular pieces) and analysis-synthesis work. In some other schools a team coordination has been developed, one teaching member a specialist in syntactical matters, the other attending to historical orientation. In still other schools separate classes have been maintained with subject matter succession channelled into a parallel effort.[3]

The particular plan devised is not the crucial issue. Such choices must be based on local circumstances and available faculty talents and temperaments. The essential ingredients are *correlation* and *integration* whereby segments of information are continually related one to another. This correlation produces for the student a more vivid and concrete impression of any topic considered in either theory or literature. It is an additional safeguard against subject matter becoming the object of learning rather than of the learner and his future life as a musician.

A Final Note About Analysis

In conclusion let us agree on a subtle yet important point that has to do with the fundamental goals of analysis. This is that one important objective is to answer the question *Why?* as it applies to any of the isolable facets of a piece of music. True, the first essential step of analysis is to find out *what* happens in the sense of how a piece breaks down into a particular complex hierarchy of interrelated sound patterns. But the final questions of analysis are *Why?* questions:

> Why is there a deceptive cadence rather than a more terminal effect at this location, and why is its effect deceptive in the first place?
>
> Why is this melody in the key of B♭, and what makes it so?
>
> Why should the loudness level increase here rather than two measures later?
>
> Why is a state of ambiguity affected within this passage, what are the causes of ambiguity here, and why did the composer desire this rather than clarity?
>
> What creates the effect of stasis in this section, and why did the composer wish to avoid any sense of motion here?

These are the kinds of ultimate questions analysis must seek to answer. They are the important questions because in our attempts to provide answers we develop a way of knowing that is more readily transferable to a variety of musics. To know *what* happens in a Beethoven Scherzo leaves

[3]For further information about these experimental programs see *Comprehensive Musicianship and Undergraduate Music Curricula*, by David Willoughby (Washington: Music Educators National Conference, 1971).

us only with Beethoven; to know *why* events occur, in terms of the dynamics of tonal relationships, yields a kind of knowledge that better prepares us to cope with the real musical basis rather than with mere particular manifestations of that basis.

Good analysis provides explicit and verifiable answers for questions which otherwise can be answered only by intuition. Intuition works and is an essential part even of the keen analyst's technique. But intuition, like a woman in the Gershwin song, "is a sometimes thing." It must be nudged along by rational deductive processes. We cannot teach intuition, but we can teach analytical procedures. Hopefully these will be procedures which do in fact provide the student with effective means for dealing with the music he will encounter in his future life whether he be composer, teacher, performer, or consumer.

Compositional Processes and Writing Skills

WARREN BENSON

Compositional processes and writing skills etch in our minds and eyes, mold into our hands, and record in our ears how basic musical materials may unite to create a musical gesture. A commitment to the written statement of our musical understanding, however great or small, perfect or flawed, brings us directly in touch with the great musical, human expressions in our heritage, which we can then appreciate out of our own experiences.

What are some of the elements that need to be understood as fundamental to any meaningful experience with compositional processes and the exemplification of these through the development of writing skills? In the first place, compositional processes cannot be considered without considering the fundamental issue of the creative act. The compositional process might be generally described in the following manner: It is the translating of an original impulse — be it a feeling, a need to illustrate or comment musically on a given situation or phenomenon, a commission, or a class assignment — into an understandable and concrete form. Beginning with even the vaguest notion and developing it into a more precise understanding of what the original impulse means, the creative process uses musical language to form a more specific, clarifying idea — a musical idea, perhaps a musical phrase. As this original schematic germ cell defines the overall implications of our notion, it is necessary to expand our understanding of it by exploring the many facets of its being. The translation of these musical ideas into the symbols of our language and writing them down on paper requires us to use the greatest precision in making decisions that effect the subtleties of our expression, as they will be revealed through the language of musical symbols. These are the most general aspects of the compositional process. The inner workings of this process require attention to specific musical details, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

We must understand that the compositional process is very personal, perhaps even private. It is important to realize that our art is predicated on unique personal experience. Therefore it is important that any consideration of writing skills recognizes the fact that the ultimate end of writing skills, as we observe in the great literature of our art, is personal expression. With this in mind it is not possible for me to separate my approach to this subject into two neat, mutually exclusive compartments labeled Compositional Processes on the one hand, and Writing Skills on the other. If by writing skills we mean only musical calligraphy, this is another matter. In order for the musical symbols that may exist as a metaphor for the private vision of any individual to be understood, it is obviously necessary that they be legible and in a reasonably available language.

In the past much emphasis has been given to the issue of personal expression through music. In practice it has been the exception to find this emphasis in areas of study other than performance and musical composition. It is at the very core of a comprehensive musical education that this emphasis flow naturally into other areas of the student's experience within the music curriculum. The place where one would expect compositional processes and writing skills to be linked with past experiences is in courses traditionally called "theory." However, it is hardly necessary to point out that many theory teachers have not been concerned with the personal expression of the student but rather with his ability to demonstrate an understanding of refined stylistic mannerisms — "rules of harmony" — with his expressive choice always being influenced by externally imposed restrictions. This leads us to a critical point in our concern with the student's musical understanding as it concerns basic musical phenomena.

If it can be said that the compositional process generally has concerned itself with some basic principles that have proven effective in delineating musical gestures from the earliest times to the present, then it is important to understand this statement in relationship to recent practice in the area of theory teaching. My experience in visiting many campuses and conversing with colleagues throughout the country substantiates that students are not made aware of such basic principles and techniques as are implicit in the following questions:

How does one sustain a musical idea?
How does one stop the flow of a musical idea?
How does one effect a musical cadence?
How does one create a musical climax?
How does one know when to climax in a musical statement?
How does one relieve musical tension?
How does one avoid musical compartmentalization in favor of longer spans of experience?
How does one achieve unity and variety in a single work?
And many more such questions.

Understanding the answers to some of these questions might provide insight into what we assume to be the understanding of the great composers of our tradition. Within the core of common knowledge represented by the understanding of these issues, we have a unity of process that includes radical stylistic individuality and varying ranges of competence. However, the study of a style that deals with limited texture, limited rhythmic language, and limited tessitura, as found within the customary four-voice, abstract, choral approach to the teaching of written harmony, does not allow much concern for many of the items mentioned.

If the answers to some of the above questions represent a core of common understanding, and if style represents the incidence of stylistic, idiosyncratic eruptions from this common core, then we have been con-

cerning ourselves only with the tips of the erupting peaks and not with the broad foundation of common experience and understanding. (This is to say nothing of the limited opportunity for individuality when one is primarily concerned with imitating someone else's style.)

As a student I do not remember having one assignment returned with any commentary on the expressive value or beauty of my effort. Such papers usually came back with certain errors noted, points duly subtracted from the mythical perfect score, and the admonition to mind my fifths and octaves. Although in many cases I was harmonizing a well-known chorale melody, it was never fundamental to the assignment nor to the course devoted to these chorales, that one understand the expressive implications of the text. One seemed to be putting black dots on paper with no particular purpose beyond the ability to determine the most appropriate choices within a limited range. Analysis of chorale examples did not concern itself with the relationship between the particular harmonization of the chorale melody and the appropriate text, nor between several harmonizations of the same text. It seemed to be a two-year experience devoted to the development of a rather limited technology.

The application of the skills and understandings learned in such a situation could not be considered under any circumstances "comprehensive." Too much music incorporating only one or two lines or many voices in vocabularies that ignored the system we had learned was outside our understanding on the basis of the information we had acquired. It would seem, therefore, that "theory" served only that classroom and that time on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

It is not the exclusive function of a course that includes compositional processes and writing skills to train composers. It is, rather, to give the musically concerned student the tools of a craft, the grammar and syntax of a language, through which he may express himself. In presenting information relating to some of the questions asked of the student, the teacher should draw upon examples from the student's musical heritage which reveal a similar use of this grammar and syntax to realize certain musical gestures effectively. Analysis, therefore, should be fundamental to the learning of these compositional skills.

In making decisions that relate to the flow of musical ideas, their appropriateness, their intensity, and their continuity, it is necessary for the student to make value judgments time and again. Such opportunities are difficult to come by in a conventional curriculum. If our association with music is limited to acknowledged musical masterpieces, the development of the ability to recognize weaknesses, flaws, incompetence, technical fumbling, or expressive vulgarity will be limited at best. If we work with the development of a musical statement (as simple as a phrase) *that is an original effort of the student,* then the student must make many judgments in every assignment. Thus it is imperative that judgment be recognized as an important factor in the exercise of our skills and knowledge. (This

presupposes that it is the obligation of the teacher to base observations on the work of each of his students on both his own experience and references to pertinent musical examples.)

In order to effect a vital musical experience, it is necessary to provide an opportunity for all student compositions to be performed. This suggests that assignments be written for performance by other members of the class. If possible, classes should contain a variety of instrumentalists, keyboard performers, and singers, thus offering a variety of timbral resources and bringing into consideration the basic elements of the study of "orchestration." A discussion of the appropriateness of the music for the instrument or voice selected is also pertinent. Here too the issue of musical calligraphy is important in that the quality of the performance may be assisted or inhibited by the quality of the calligraphy. Attention must also be paid to the notation of expression marks, dynamics, and interpretive suggestions for the performer.

A discussion of the effectiveness of a particular piece should consider such things as the following:

Does the piece succeed in making its intended general impression?
Does it do this in spite of some weaknesses?
What is the general nature of the weaknesses?
What are their specific causes?
What are possible remedies?
Can the student rewrite questionable passages and sustain his original musical impulse.
Is the revised version better than the original effort?
Is the musical statement complete?
Is the language used consistent within itself?
Is the experience of the piece a satisfying one?
In what ways is it satisfying—technically, sensuously, emotionally, or as a combination of these?

In considering these types of questions, the development of confidence in evaluating music will be considerably assisted. (If one of the problems of music in public education is its low level of quality, perhaps it is because musical practitioners at that level of instruction have not had the opportunity in their own student experience to develop a critical ability.)

The understanding of why a particular piece "comes off" in its first rehearsal and another does not might well be gained from performing each student's work in class. The use of musical examples in varying degrees of technical complexity for the performer might well be brought to bear on this issue.

The ability to translate a vague musical idea into a specific, realizable musical shape should be a primary concern for all students as they progress through varying stages of their development and understanding of compo-

sitional processes and writing skills: *form* as a living force, not a dead example.

The use of a variety of musical examples in various idiosyncratic styles to demonstrate the handling of a musical principle (for example, the making of a large-scale musical climax) will bring the student immediately into contact with a wide variety of literature in a broad historical perspective. This attempt to understand the broadest musical principles at work will facilitate the application of attitudes and competencies that develop from the study of compositional processes and writing skills to the areas of musical history and literature, performance, conducting, orchestration, and performance techniques.

It is quite possible for faculty members in musical areas other than theory to call upon these skills and understandings in checking what has been observed and absorbed in their own areas of specialization. For example, in a class in music literature a student might come to understand the style of a composer or an epoch by observing the special emphases on particular musical devices and materials and the manners in which these emphases were revealed; therefore, it would seem possible that he could demonstrate his assimilation of the elements of a certain style by writing a piece emphasizing those stylistic idiosyncracies. An applied music student might write etudes designed to overcome weaknesses in his technique. A conducting student might compose examples which call on him to exercise pertinent techniques, e.g., how to handle a fermata, an anacrusis, or a metric change. A music education student interested in music in elementary schools might write original teaching materials, songs, dance music, percussion pieces, etc., and, as a by-product, become a better monitor of his own students' compositional efforts.

Not least of the important considerations is revealing the creative ability inherent in every person. While past practices of filling in someone else's design, writing music "by the numbers," completing the coloring book by staying within someone else's lines of demarcation may have certain values, they are not to be confused with the greater values inherent in the process of self-discovery which is basic to the creative experience. The level at which we communicate with our peers in normal academic intercourse can be considerably deepened through participation in the most personal mode of expression available to man: the pure creative act, be it large or small, perfect or flawed. The pursuit of the goal of realizing one's own musical conception in terms of a specific musical language recorded for others to understand can be a very exciting learning experience, and is at the core of the concept of comprehensive musicianship.

Music History and Literature

WILLIAM J. MITCHELL

The term "comprehensive musicianship" or its embodiment, the comprehensive musician, has become an educational household expression over the last few years. An inevitable misunderstanding has accompanied its establishment. In its extreme form of misapprehension, a comprehensive musician is thought to be highly specialized as a musicologist, performer on all instruments, composer, teacher, conductor, a theorist versed in all theories, and, in his spare moments, a Dean. A moment's reflection should make it clear that it has never been the aim of the Contemporary Music Project to produce such a monster.

Rather, the aims have been essentially pragmatic in nature, based on the desire to bring the specialist to a broader maturity in his area of excellence by means of the contributions that might be made to his education by disciplines hitherto considered remote and removed. In part this end is to be achieved through an enlargement of the fields covered by the subject matter of music, both within and without his specialization, in part by constant attempts to stimulate in him attitudes of criticism, assessment, and curiosity which could lead to his becoming an individual capable of forming independent musical judgments rather than a stereotyped product of his institution and its teachers. Such an individual, should he in turn become a teacher, would be in a position to infuse his courses with enthusiasm, experimentation, and creativity while avoiding confinement and stodginess. In all of its aims CMP espouses discipline while shunning deadly routinism.

The purposes of this paper are twofold. First I propose to describe how the study of the history and literature of music can contribute to the broadened horizons of the performer, composer, teacher, or, in general, those students who are not pointed toward the career of musical historian. Second I propose to describe some of the ways in which performance, the development of musical writing skills, the teaching of music, and the intrusion of other apparently nonhistorical matters can enrich the study of the history and literature of music.

Under the "history and literature" of music I include all musical matters pertaining to our past and leading up to our present. Moreover, the spread of the subject is considered to reach far beyond the earlier confines of European cultures and their American descendants or counterparts. There was once a course in the history of music that set as the boundaries of the first two semesters' study the Council of Trent and the Congress of Vienna. If instruction in history is still confined in such a mold, it must be considered hopelessly obsolete even if a third semester should end with the founding of the League of Nations. At the same time it would be an evasion of our responsibility to ignore the constant problem of the music historian

whose subject grows longer and larger daily. He must avoid a doting attention to one small fragment of his vast subject while, at the same time, refusing to engage in a breathless sprint through the ages. Perhaps it is enough if we simply describe the problem here and let the historian resolve it as he sees fit in the light of remarks to come. It is suggested, nevertheless, that one kind of easement might lie in the study of artworks as the points of focus and departure. Too often, at least in my experience, the opposite is true: the music is often buried hopelessly beneath a mountain of terms, bibliographies, and dates.

Contributions of the Study of History and Literature

The historian is often in a position to make enviable contributions to our musical maturation. Presumably, as a result of his own study of the music of many times and places, he can not only help to enlarge our repertory, he can also provide us with insights into style differentiation. Too often the degree of our understanding and the musicality of our performance are determined by an awareness of the stylistic mores of a single period, area, composer, or composition.

Under the general heading of style, we need to include more than form and continuation techniques, harmonic or polyphonic features, rhythm, timbre, texture, and instrumentation. Just as important are such factors as the method of writing a musical score, the presence or absence of accidentals, performance directions, the extent and kind of improvisation expected of the performer, and the social function of the music (was it designed for church, court, open air, concert hall, the bistro, opera house, salon?). Other matters that the historian can contribute to our understanding of musical style, such as the relationship of a work to traditional procedures, innovative modes, text, libretto, dance, or rite, can easily lead to intensified and insightful performance.

The list could be much extended of course. However, it should be apparent that not every item need be brought into play in each instance. The point is that there are many sources and kinds of information that can be opened up to us by the historian and that these can lead to a more penetrating understanding of *all* music and to more meaningful performances. The study of style in these senses can do much to enlarge our capacity for music beyond that with which most of us grew up, music which, because of its splendor and perfection, tends to imprison us in the stylistic stereotypes of the 18th and 19th centuries. The aim is not to abandon these two centuries, but to enlarge on them constantly, forwards, backwards, and laterally. If, in embarking on such broadened explorations, piloted by the historian, we should be steered at times into the doldrums, into stagnant waters, this will not be too great a price to pay for the eventual discovery of new continents of music. The comprehensive musician can not venture less if he is to become or remain comprehensive.

The study of music history and literature can perform an additional

valuable service for the performer and the teacher. It can lead them to scores that provide a reasonably accurate representation of the composers' intentions. Despite the increased availability of so-called *Urtext* scores, it is depressing to note the number of inferior editions that continue to be used by performing students everywhere and, far worse, that continue to be defended by their teachers. These remarks are not limited to early or modern or various ethnic kinds of music, but to such standard items as the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, the Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven sonatas, and similar works.

The study of history and literature can perform an important service in reshaping our notions about the "theory of music." A limited reading of medieval and renaissance writings on theory will suffice to make it clear that theory meant speculation. The writing of music and the prescribing for the student of rules of syntax were contained under the title, in one form or another, of Practical Music or Musical Practice. It is an irony that most of us today classify such studies as ear training, sightreading, keyboard harmony, counterpoint, and harmonization under the heading, Music Theory, when only the tattered fragments of Practical Music remain. A useful term that is slowly replacing the misnomer, Theory, is Musicianship. However, a complete changeover, though much to be desired, will take considerable time.

Be this as it may, our musicianship (or theory) courses still rest largely on the stylistic features of 18th- and 19th-century music with occasional forays into so-called modal, or 16th-century counterpoint and 20th-century techniques. The study of the history and literature of music can provide us with helpful insights into the directions that might be followed as we modify or enlarge the subject matter of our musicianship curriculum. There have been and are at the present time many theories of music and, similarly, many musical practices. Yet we remain pretty much under the theoretical system of Jean-Philippe Rameau and the practice derived from it. Recommended in any serious attempt to bring instruction in musicianship in line with other aspects of comprehensive musicianship is a longlasting coalition of theorist, composer, educator, and historian.

In summary: I have suggested that some of the ways in which the historian or the study of the history and literature of music can contribute to the development of the comprehensive musician are 1) an enlargement of our musical repertory; 2) an increase in our understanding of the many varieties of music through a much broadened stylistic study; 3) the seeking out of good, accurate musical scores; and 4) the renovating of our musicianship curriculums. This is only a partial list intended to do no more than stand as an indication of the ways in which history and historians can become part of a broad educational undertaking designed to produce the comprehensive musician.

The Enrichment of the Study of History and Literature

Courses of instruction in the history and literature of music cannot, save in isolated instances, serve as models of modern educational procedure. More often than not they start too early, end too soon, and follow a narrow well-trodden path. It is not necessary to dwell on the fact that our knowledge of early music, from classical Greece through the early middle ages remains gapped, belonging more in the domain of the acutely trained specialist than of the burgeoning musician. Also, because in earlier times folk and popular music lacked the scribes that church music had in great numbers, there is an understandable tendency in history courses to dwell on the known or at least partly knowable in preference to vague oral traditions. Unfortunately, this separation of the sacred and the profane, born perhaps of necessity, tends to perpetuate itself as we arrive at later periods when data of both kinds are more readily and plenteously available. These, however, are problems related to subject matter, which can be resolved in one or another satisfactory way by the ingenious instructor.

More germane to our interests in history and comprehensive musicianship is the manner in which the subject might be represented in the classroom. It is well within the realm of possibility to present a year's course in the history of music without playing a single example. It is also possible to turn the course over to a disc jockey with instructions to play recordings in a reasonably accurate chronological sequence. Neither extreme is desirable, but a fusion of the two combined with other highly significant activities could easily make the study cogent, enriching, and serviceable.

There is no question that expository talk is a requisite of the study, nor is there any question that performance of, let us say, the Finale of Beethoven's *Ninth* had better be entrusted to a carefully selected recording than to a guitarist. However, this leaves a vast area where the guitar, other instruments, and the voice can be called upon to play an active role in vivifying the study of the history of music. I propose that much can be learned effectively by means of direct participation in the performance of various historical types of music, with painstaking guidance in matters of style and manner of performance provided by the instructor. In those many cases known to me where such an activity has been engaged in, the results have been salutary, despite the occasional ineptness of the performance. The point to be kept in mind is that such playing is not designed to achieve the level of a "concert" rendition. Rather it is in the nature of laboratory work, suggestive and often tentative, but always capable of becoming highly informative and directly contributory to the development of the comprehensive musician.

Other activities suggest themselves which belong properly in the study of the history of music: the writing of works or short exercises in stylistic imitation of a given period or genre; the preparation of modern scores derived from earlier notational and performing conventions; the fashioning

of thorough-bass accompaniments (as distinct from thorough-bass exercises); the building of simple instruments (a start might be made with the monochord); the preparation by students of program notes for various campus concerts based on guided research; the evaluation of multiple recordings of the same work. The list is virtually endless.

These activities should not be misunderstood. I am not proposing that the study of the history and literature of music be reduced to courses in basket weaving. I am suggesting, however, that an inviting route to a keener understanding of the challenging intellectual and complex cultural components of our artistic heritage lies in our engaging in the music making activities of various periods. Guided confrontation with the literature of music can be beneficial not only in enlarging our knowledge of and interest in many kinds and aspects of music; it can also stimulate us to ask many questions about the art, to which answers of a more or less satisfactory nature can be found in writings about music from many sources, old and new. It is in such a manner that the comprehensive historian can be nurtured.

In summary it is suggested that the springboard for the study of music history is *music*, that constant exposure through performance and related musical activities will lead more persuasively to the seeking out of secondary supporting data about the art, and that these will take on greater significance as they are related directly to involvement with the artworks themselves.

Performance and Applied Musical Skills

SAMUEL ADLER

In a recent survey conducted by the National Music League regarding the future of concerts and the young concert musician, questionnaires were sent to colleges, universities, and community concert managers to inquire about the state of the "concert business." The result of these inquiries indicated that

> In this electronic age live audiences are not growing as fast as the general population. . . . The future of the young artist is not bright. Even big-name performers are finding it more and more difficult to draw audiences; to make matters worse, their managers report that the *only* artists they can sell are the ones with established careers.

I realize full well that most of us are aware of these facts. Yet I quote this passage because, with all the warning signs around us and knowing the existing contemporary situation facing the young musician who is trained in applied music at one of our conservatories or schools of music, we still for the most part have failed to prepare the young artist for the *actual* tasks which he will be called upon to perform. Am I saying that the concert field is closed to the talented, young performer? Should we discontinue training performers? Isn't the field of orchestral playing still a very lucrative one? Should our studios no longer aim toward the goal of having our students win the many competitions that yearn to be entered and mastered?

The answer to these important questions as far as I am concerned is: 1) The concert field is not closed but has ceased to exist as we once knew it. 2) We should continue to produce performers, except that these individuals must be more than mere performers on their instrument to survive today. 3) The field of orchestral playing is in flux but, as I shall try to point out later, will be an exciting challenge to the "different" kind of performing musician of the future. 4) Competitions have and will continue to lure our most talented performers, but these students should be warned that even though the winning of a competition is important, the residue or the reward of many concert appearances and of instantaneous fame accompanied by fortune is a fact that has ceased to exist.

From these answers one can easily see that I am not pessimistic about the performer's opportunities in the future; on the contrary, I am of the opinion that with proper management and skills the performer will face a more exciting and in many ways more musically rewarding future than ever before. However, those of us involved in the higher education of the performer or the student interested in perfecting his applied music skills are guilty of what I would almost like to call fraud or at least deception in the

training of these young people. We have failed to reexamine the requirements which the young artist must master in order to face the contemporary job market. I do not wish to sound crass, but the use of the term "contemporary job market" is intentional, to focus on a major concern of CMP.

For the purpose of our discussion, I should like to be permitted to redefine the term "contemporary" in the title of the Contemporary Music Project. The term has so often been misunderstood and misinterpreted as signifying an attempt to focus on contemporary music in our schools. While that is certainly a portion of the goals of the Project, it is only a very small segment governing the Project's philosophy. My definition of the word "contemporary" is much more inclusive and in the education of the prospective performer stands for the attitude that his training must prepare him to meet the new or "now" requirements demanded of him for presently available positions under existing conditions in the world of music. The product of our educational institutions must be a person who is exceptionally facile and skilled on his instrument, but by virtue of his extensive training and background in the entire analytical, historical, pedagogical and theoretical music spectrum will be able to handle the additional requirements associated with his position no matter what these would be. That is what the contemporary concern must be: to turn out the comprehensive musician.

Let me be more specific:

I believe that the symphony orchestra will survive, and even though I may be dreaming, I see its future in this country as a very vital organization functioning as a kind of music bank. There will be fewer major orchestras in America, but I believe better ones, and ones that will be very closely associated with the musical life of a particular geographic area. They will be loosely attached to state university systems or other schools within a state, their members teaching, performing and coaching chamber music, conducting, lecturing, and instructing courses not necessarily in their major area of musical concentration. Multiply this orchestral concept by fifty, plus many of our more populated states that support three or four orchestral units, and you have a sizeable market in search of talent for comprehensively prepared students.

The concert pianist also can look for a bright but very different future. I believe that the collegiate concert circuit with exchanges of artists and growing interest in music rather than names, which we must nurture in our own schools, will eventually open up exciting possibilities. However, the ability to teach master classes, analyze and verbalize about music, accompany, and deal with the subject of stylistic interpretation, will become increasingly important in each artist's future development. I certainly do not wish to imply that these conditions apply only to the performing solo pianist; they are equally if not more relevant to the requirements sought of the solo performer on any instrument.

Lest I be accused of any kind of prejudice, I want to add the singer, for

even he or she must now be comprehensively trained, since a career in opera and the recital stage is, I am afraid, a dream of the past except for a very few individuals. Today singers must train their ears and their powers of musical analysis and comprehension. Especially as teachers they must be interested in other forms of music even if these are not related to the vocal field, and it is about time that the vocal teacher ceased to denigrate the art of choral singing, refusing in many cases to prepare his students to function adequately in choral situations, because this field is the growing area in which vocal talents will be employed.

One additional complication must be mentioned before proceeding further. Besides the many facets added to the roles that performing musicians are expected to fulfill, contemporary music written for performance by these musicians requires techniques and insights and in some cases stylistic, compositional, and improvisational skills for which they are not at all prepared. I would even go a step further towards the creative aspect of the modern performer. It has been found very successful in our experimental CMP courses to encourage students to compose etudes illustrating contemporary principles studied in class for which no etudes exist, and since they require new technical challenges are sometimes considered technically awkward for the particular instrument.

CMP has never claimed to be a panacea for all musical ills, but I believe that the constant examination of both roles and tasks which professional performers are called upon to assume and the results of the experiments of the Project during the past decade can serve as useful guides to the comprehensive and more relevant musical education of future artist-performers.

In the distant past most performers were composers, trained as such through many years of apprenticeship to great masters who personified comprehensiveness in the field of music and therefore, by means of the strictest and most concentrated ways, produced musicians fit for the positions of the day. As the solo performer and composer slowly metamorphosed into two different individuals, the comprehensive knowledge of music and its skills polarized towards one or the other with the composer usually more comprehensively oriented than the performer. More specialists were created who broke down the principle of all-inclusive knowledge even more minutely as the split took on greater proportions, producing many more categories of musicians each "doing his own thing," thereby adding to the performance specialist and the musical creator (including the conductor), the music historian or musical scholar, the theoretician, and even the musical popularist who can tell entertaining anecdotes without possessing any deep or concrete knowledge or understanding about the music. It seems to me that we have almost come full circle, and it is our pleasant (at least in my view) duty to turn out "the master" musician, the well-rounded comprehensive musician, once again.

This means a closely coordinated course of study for him. Certainly he

must be proficient on his applied instrument, even more so because of the tremendous new technical demands which he is called upon to execute when tackling most of the music of his own time. Besides this his courses in basic musicianship must provide him with the tools to analyze and comprehend any music regardless of style or period. These courses must provide historical as well as performance-practice information vital to the interpretation of old as well as new music. The plan of study must include a wider range of basic musical skills. Rhythm now has to be stressed more and more to deal adequately with the extremely complex rhythmic structures of both contemporary and medieval music. Ear training should include not only dictation from a piano, but dictation from instruments, voices, instrumental combinations, a chorus, etc. Besides this it is important that the student write creative exercises and perform these in class, coaching, correcting, and conducting them until a perfect performance is realized. This trains an ear more keenly perhaps than any other exercise.

I certainly do not want to go on with specifics with which CMP has experimented these last few years in training the more comprehensive performer. Nevertheless, while we are on specifics I wish to emphasize one other area that has been neglected almost completely: the training of students to make knowledgeable value judgments based on musical criteria. When I was a young student majoring in violin, I was exposed to the whole gamut of the literature of that instrument. Naturally I played Spohr, Vieuxtemps, Viotti, and even DeBeriot and Kreutzer along with the great masterpieces of the string literature. I remember very well (as I am sure many students of all instruments in similar situations do) loving these typical violin pieces as much if not more than the works by the great masters. These were tailor-made for the violin and even though relatively easy to perform they sounded difficult and spectacular. One would expect that the more one learned about music the more one would forget about the "facile" showpiece and choose only the great works. However, this seems to be contrary to the fact, for taste and value judgments about what is good or poor in our art is the least developed sensitivity of all. Most instrumentalists, vocalists, and conductors — as well as audiences — accept the value standards of their teachers or musical "experts" without ever questioning these judgments. It is high time that we included in our instruction one of the unique features that CMP has stressed in its experimental courses, namely, the ability to evaluate a piece of music or a performance judiciously, based on the musical tools of analysis, performance, and especially composition. This skill would in my opinion revolutionize the repertory of elementary and secondary schools, colleges, as well as concert and recital programs, and would open our eyes to the narrowness of the present exposure to musical works of the past and present. This narrowness is a result of inertia fostered by a training that has led us to accept the judgments of others rather than challenging us and providing us with the sophisticated musical perspective to judge for ourselves.

To translate this kind of an instructional program into the reality of our existing music schools is a difficult task, but it can be and in some cases has been extremely successful. In the first place it needs very close cooperation and extremely good communication among all departments and faculty members. The walls of secrecy must disappear along with the selfish, possessive wishes that students owe exclusive allegiance to their applied departments. All members of the faculty must work toward the *combined* goal of providing the performing music student with the skill, knowledge, and desire to become a comprehensive musician in order that he be relevant and vital in the music world now and in the near future. Every musician today is a music educator, not only those who specialize in public school music. Most certainly the performer has the tasks of educating as an integral part of his position in life.

We can no longer entrust the education of our best young performers solely to artists now teaching in our institutions who have a 19th- or, at best, early 20th-century protective mentality about the goals of their students. This kind of master-performer does not want to see a greatly expanded role forced upon his wards by contemporary conditions and, thus, is preparing them for a world that no longer exists. Possibly this is a world which actually has never existed and an ambition which, because it was realized by so few and is therefore so narrow, has perhaps played a decisive role in the alienation of our concert audiences, perpetuating the myth of the performer rather than the reality of music. These erroneous concerns have also made a sham of most of the music instruction in our public schools, seldom offering a relevant and meaningful comprehensive musical experience to our children.

I submit that very few comprehensively trained applied musicians are available today because of the old-fashioned psychology that continues to pervade many of our music schools. CMP, which has become the nagging conscience of our endeavors to teach our art today, admonishes us to constantly analyze job requirements. Today these call for a differently trained performer, one who is a comprehensive musician able to analyze and communicate musically as well as verbally, who can perform alone or in combination with other instrumentalists and vocalists, who knows the literature of the past and the present, who is able to coach and even conduct far more than his limited performance area, who has the theoretical as well as creative skills to make musical and aesthetic judgments, and who can create musical examples to make new adventures out of traditional performance situations.

We continue to train specialists, following the tradition of our time, in the *one* field where a well-rounded, comprehensively schooled person is an absolute necessity (even though the world about him stresses specialization and compartmentalization). CMP's never static, ever-changing, ever-probing attitude toward the teaching of the art of music is to me the answer that will help provide applied music majors with the broader knowledge

and skills they will need in the future. Goethe once said: "Nothing is more terrible than ignorance in action." We run the danger of unleashing incompetence upon our music world if we permit performing musicians to graduate from conservatories and music schools inadequately trained for the changing and expanded positions they are expected to occupy.

The Musician as Teacher

ROBERT KLOTMAN

There should be nothing revealing nor startling when I say that some of the world's greatest artists have been among the poorest teachers. Musical skill and talent alone are no certain guarantee of competent instruction. On the other hand no matter how informed one may be of learning theories and teaching techniques, unless he possesses the necessary knowledge, proficiency, and musicality, he is equally inept as a teacher.

Good teaching in the studio, classroom, or rehearsal hall should be as demanding as artistry on the concert stage. It is equally rare. Charles Ives once said that "teaching is an art, and only the artist should teach." This statement has often been misconstrued to imply that only performing artists should be permitted to teach. I believe what Ives intended was that every teacher has an obligation to approach teaching in much the same way that every artist approaches a concert performance. In this sense every teacher should strive to be an artist-teacher with all of the ramifications that the description conveys. The terms mean not only developing one's musical skills but also being able to apply them to the art of teaching.

Attitudes Toward the Teaching of Music

No artist-teacher should function without an articulated, personal philosophy toward education and the role of music in education. His philosophy should be relevant, current, comprehensive, and applicable at all levels of music education. It should apply sufficiently to his special interest or particular level of instruction and should reflect the unique function of music as an art.

A teacher's philosophy should encompass beliefs that provide him with a basis for the conduct of music programs in both an educational setting and the larger community. It should help him understand why he is teaching, what he is teaching, how he is teaching, and what he hopes his students will accomplish. He should be able to express in an articulate manner a philosophy that conveys clearly his commitment to music and its unique contribution to life in our society.

Once this philosophy is developed it should serve as a basis for formulating objectives, objectives that emanate from the needs of students and that are conceived in musical terms. With these objectives as a guide a teacher needs to plan appropriate activities that will guide students to develop specific musical proficiencies. This process is aided by open communication and considerable involvement with students, colleagues, and other resource persons.

Today the competition for men's minds, hearts, and time is more intense than ever before. Knowledge of one's subject is no longer sufficient to

justify teaching it to the next generation. A musician who teaches music must be able to deal with professional issues in an intelligent, articulate manner; this can be done only if there is a clear, philosophical basis for determining the purpose and function of music in the school and in the community.

Making Music Teaching Contemporary

Although some successful music teachers have managed to deal with learning intuitively, a complete musician-teacher keeps himself informed regarding the application to the teaching of music of modern theories of learning and advances in educational technology. Programmed instruction and systems approaches could be utilized to teach musical skills with greater efficiency. Much more research in this area is needed for the music profession.

Students as a group are better informed today and more knowledgeable at an earlier age than any generation before them. Many have been exposed to a variety of ethnic groups and their music in a manner that was inconceivable to educators as recently as 25 years ago. Young people today have formulated definite opinions and have developed tastes regarding music through their exposure to the variety of media available to them. The students' capacity that they bring to a classroom for in-depth perception, knowledge, and understanding is startling. To be effective in this setting competent music educators must possess a broad knowledge of musical repertory encompassing all historical periods. Furthermore they should be able to relate this knowledge to contemporary society. In this sense they also need to acquire knowledge of a wide variety of Western and non-Western styles, instruments, and materials. Teachers need to acquire sufficient knowledge and technique to supervise or demonstrate electronically amplified equipment. They need to be familiar with current devices used for sound amplification and instrument construction so that they may, with their students, identify and explore developments as they occur.

All of these skills are synthesized into what is regarded as a competent musician-teacher who demonstrates by example the concept of comprehensive musicianship as it relates to teaching. Comprehensive musicianship programs are not to be regarded as a series of compartmentalized activities but rather a way of learning music. For the teacher it is the way he teaches and the manner in which he expresses himself. Under these conditions students learn to think and to express themselves as musicians. To demonstrate and convey concepts of comprehensive musicianship, teachers need to develop the ability to communicate in musical terms. They must involve their students in understanding the esthetics of all music; they must provide learning experiences that incorporate basic knowledge regarding the elements of music; and they must expose students to broad areas of the musical repertory.

The "teacher" discussed thus far does not refer only to those who are

certified by law and so designated to "teach" at the K-12 levels, but rather to most members of the music profession who, I would submit, spend a great portion of their time in the act of "teaching" in the broadest sense of the word. Thus, in the comprehensive education of musicians some consideration must be given to their role as teachers. It is for this reason that the skills of communication should be considered as an integral part of the professional education of music teachers.

Some of the skills and qualities identified in this paper as being desirable for prospective teachers may be more a matter of personality and temperament than of education. This means that there must be a greater concern for selecting candidates for the music profession. Potential teachers need to be identified earlier, certainly as early as high school. Music schools need to develop better selection procedures and to enforce them. They must accept greater responsibility for accepting candidates into their teacher training programs. They must have well defined evaluative procedures and retention policies that enable them to assess continually a student's progress as a future teacher.

Probably the most controversial area in the training of the school music teacher which exists outside the specific field of music is the general education component. All aspiring music teachers need substantial experiences in general education during their preservice training. This has often been a source of concern to many music students and departments of music. However, when examined closely this concern is usually based on the manner in which the courses are taught and the rigid requirements attached to them rather than on the concept of broadening one's experiences.

Universities should consider more extensive use of the pass-fail option to encourage students to pursue courses in general education. Students in music need to explore such broad areas as natural science, social science, the visual arts, and humanities. An understanding of relationships between music and other disciplines is important for the well-educated musician. Information about music's place in history, its esthetic nature, and its peculiar communicative potential is as much the responsibility of the music teacher as the social scientist, the philosopher, or the English professor.

The MENC Commission on Teacher Education,* in its standards dealing with professional training, states that "all music method courses be taught by successful music educators regularly engaged in teaching students of ages appropriate to the specific courses." By teaching part-time or occasionally, these instructors will better be able to keep abreast of current developments and to have close contact with elementary and secondary school music programs.

All teacher education institutions need to work toward joint responsi-

*Dr. Klotman served as chairman of the Commission on Teacher Education of the Music Educators National Conference. That Commission, which functioned from 1968 to 1972, was in the midst of its activity at the time this paper was prepared.

bility with school systems for developing and implementing teacher education programs. Too many college methods courses are taught to future music educators by teachers too long removed from current situations in today's classrooms. Neophyte teachers in music education frequently have complained that they were not adequately prepared for teaching in the inner-city, in general music classes, or in integrated arts or humanities programs. Much more work in preparing future teachers for these situations must be done in precollege classrooms as well as on college campuses.

Another recommendation of the Commission on Teacher Education is that "each prospective music educator be involved, throughout the college years beginning with the first, with a program of in-school observations and participation in teaching-learning situations." Delaying contact with children until almost the end of the formal training period fails to relate professional methods courses to actual classroom experience, and under these conditions education courses appear to be merely exercises in theoretical rhetoric. "It is further recommended that these on-the-site contacts with music education include experiments involving children of all age levels from preschool through secondary schools for *all* prospective educators." Too many college students are unable to evaluate clearly their own elementary experiences and automatically select secondary or college teaching as a primary objective. Later to their dismay they discover how much satisfaction can be derived from working with small children, not to mention the importance of this level of education.

Student teaching in the generic sense is the study of teaching in a live laboratory — an actual situation. It should engage students, experienced teachers, and college professors in planned, organized sequences of experiences and experiments directed to prepare a teacher to function as a competent individual capable of instructing the minds and talents entrusted to him. To be meaningful it should offer opportunities for continuous exploration and examination of educational settings under varying conditions. Too often it is limited to a static exercise demonstrating established techniques and worn-out methods. Meaningful opportunities for experimentation need to be constructed for the novice music teacher; this can be accomplished best through cooperative planning between the university music faculty and exemplary musician-teachers in the school.

As indicated earlier it is essential that teacher education programs include procedures for admission and retention, better counseling, and the development of courses of study that can be adapted to each student's interests, needs, competencies, and professional aspirations. When this is done we will teach more efficiently and more effectively. Students who demonstrate certain competencies should be exempted from these courses so that they may pursue other areas that will contribute to their development. Much frustration and wasted time can be eliminated when admission procedures are designed to help students select courses in relation to their own background and preparation. Until schools and departments of music

become more concerned about individualized programs, they will continue to rely on the few required courses in conducting and in vocal or instrumental methods. This approach is no longer adequate. The teachers of tomorrow, at any level, will need to improve their own communicative skills to deal more effectively with students, for the art of teaching and the art of communicating are inextricably linked.

REPORT

THE EDUCATION OF THE PERFORMING MUSICIAN

An Invitational Forum

SPONSORED BY

THE CONTEMPORARY MUSIC PROJECT

IN COOPERATION WITH

THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC

AND

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

YALE UNIVERSITY

APRIL 9–10, 1973

CONTENTS

Agenda 35

Participants 36

Introduction 38

Statement of Purpose — Plenary Session I 39

The Education of the Performing Musician
Lucien Wulsin 39

The Increasing Demand for Versatility — Plenary Session II 44

Professional Internships in the Arts — Plenary Session III 45

Discussions and Recommendations 46

Discussion Groups A 47

B 48

C 50

D 52

Summary 54

AGENDA

MONDAY, APRIL 9

Plenary Session I

9:00–10:20	Introduction and Greetings — Philip Nelson, Chairman
	Statement of Purpose — Lucien Wulsin
	Discussion
11:00–12:30	Discussion Groups

Plenary Session II

2:00–3:15	The Increasing Demand for Versatility Currently Facing Performers
	Panel: Bethany Beardslee, Richard Clark, Stephen Sell, Sheldon Soffer, Robert J. Werner
3:30–5:00	Discussion Groups
8:30	Concert Students of the Yale School of Music and Yale College Host — Robert Bloom

TUESDAY, APRIL 10

Plenary Session III

9:00–10:30	Professional Internships in the Arts — Edward F. D'Arms, Chairman William Porter, Howard Stein
11:00–12:00	Discussion Groups
1:30–3:00	Discussion Groups
	Draft Final Statement and Recommendations

Plenary Session IV

3:30–4:30	Presentation of Recommendations
	Summation Edward F. D'Arms, Chairman

Participants

Samuel Adler, Professor of Composition, The Eastman School of Music
Herbert Barrett, President, Herbert Barrett Management, New York City
Bethany Beardslee, Soprano, Princeton, New Jersey
Robert Bloom, Professor of Music, Yale School of Music
Igor Buketoff, Conductor, New York City
Richard Clark, President, Affiliate Artists, Inc., New York City
Arthur Custer, Director, Arts in Education Project, Rhode Island State Council on the Arts
Edward F. D'Arms, CMP Project Policy Committee
Guy Duckworth, Professor of Music, University of Colorado
Benjamin Dunham, Editor, *Symphony News,* The American Symphony Orchestra League, Vienna, Virginia
Roger Englander, Producer and Director, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York City
*Thomas Fay, Executive Officer, Yale School of Music
Claude Frank, Pianist, New York City
Robert Freeman, Director, The Eastman School of Music
Milton Fruchtman, Executive Producer, Capital Cities Broadcasting Corp., New York City
Robert Glidden, Executive Secretary, National Association of Schools of Music, Washington, D. C.
*Roger Hall, Roger Hall Associates, New York City
Sidney Harth, Head of Department of Music, Carnegie-Mellon University
Natalie Hinderas, Department of Music, Temple University
George Houle, Music Director, The New York Pro Musica, New York City
William Ivey, Executive Director, Country Music Foundation, Nashville
Charles Mark, Executive Director, National Guild of Community Music Schools, Silver Spring, Maryland
John Mauceri, Music Director, Yale Symphony Orchestra, Yale School of Music
*Robert Morris, Assistant Professor of Composition, Yale School of Music
*Philip Nelson, Dean, Yale School of Music
Benjamin Patterson, Assistant Director, Cultural Affairs, Parks, Recreation, & Cultural Affairs Administration, New York City
Harvey Phillips, Professor of Music, Indiana University
William Porter, Dean, School of Architecture, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Ray Robinson, President, Westminster Choir College
Stephen Sell, General Manager, St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, Minnesota
Sheldon Soffer, President, Sheldon Soffer Management, Inc., New York City

Howard Stein, Dean of Faculty and Students, Yale School of Drama
Billy Taylor, Billy Taylor Productions, New York City
Robert Trotter, Dean, School of Music, University of Oregon
Jonathan Tunick, Composer, Arranger, New York City
*William Waite, Professor of Music, Department of Music, Yale University
Gideon Waldrop, Dean, The Juilliard School
Robert J. Werner, Director, Contemporary Music Project
David Willoughby, Assistant Director, Contemporary Music Project
Lucien Wulsin, Chairman of the Board, D. H. Baldwin and Company, Cincinnati

REPORTERS

Doctoral Candidates, Department of Music, Yale University

Caitriona Bolster

Peter Horn

Nancy Kovaleff

Maury Yeston

*Local Planning Committee

INTRODUCTION

The Contemporary Music Project established for 1972-73 a new program called Forums on Contemporary Musicianship. Two types were planned, one to deal with issues of national interest and one for local concerns. National Forums centered on discussions of such topics as the education of professional musicians, musical performances in contemporary society, and music in the education of general college students. Summaries of discussions and recommendations emanating from these Forums will be made available to the entire profession through professional publications.

These national Forums complement the second type: local Forums in specific communities. These Forums, organized by local planning committees, involved the three components of community musical life: the professional musician, the public school and college teacher, and the layman. Representatives of each of these segments were brought together to share common goals and concerns of various artistic and educational agencies, to determine how these goals and concerns relate to the education of the professional musician and layman, and to formulate recommendations for meeting these needs, particularly through the music curricula of area colleges and universities.

It could rightly be said that all of the Contemporary Music Project's programs and activities over the past several years have inevitably led to the topics being considered by these Forums. CMP felt that a search for means of effecting the development of values and a considered reappraisal of the profession must begin with the professional education of musicians. A major emphasis in this professional education has always been toward developing the performing musician, since it is he who as the recreator of our art form is entrusted with its continuance.

During the time that the Project has been involved in the development of college programs, there has been a dramatic change in the demands placed upon musicians by the needs of society. CMP has sought to take this into consideration by seeking ways in which college curricula would better reflect the needs of performing musicians in today's society and, if possible, provide them with the skills and insights for an unknown future.

In selecting Yale as the host for this Forum, the Project turned to one of the nation's noted Schools of Music in the preparation of performers and its Department of Music which offers both preprofessional preparation and performance experiences for the general college student of the highest caliber. Its proximity to Eastern centers of cultural activity and its ability to draw upon professionals from these areas made it unique in its offering and in the people who were available for this meeting.

The diversity of background brought to this Forum by the participants was of great interest to the planners. The unanimity of recommendations and responses to the issues raised was unsolicited but significant.

It is the hope of both the participants in the Forum and the Contemporary Music Project that these recommendations and insights into the needs of the performing musician will have importance to those entrusted with this education, either as administrators or faculty.

Robert J. Werner
Director
Contemporary Music Project

Plenary Session I

A Statement of Purpose

The forty delegates who had been invited to the Forum as leaders in their field were welcomed to Yale by Dr. Philip Nelson, dean of the Yale School of Music. On behalf of the co-sponsoring Contemporary Music Project, Dr. Nelson asked four large questions that he hoped would constitute a reference point for the following Plenary Sessions and the meetings of the discussion groups: What are the implications of comprehensive musicianship for the professional school? Are we really doing the job we think we can do? What is the relationship of the institution to the real-world music profession? What is the place of the so-called "venerable" institution? To deliver the Statement of Purpose, he introduced Lucien Wulsin, chairman of the board of the D. H. Baldwin Company. Dr. Nelson noted Mr. Wulsin's education at Harvard College and the University of Virginia Law School and stressed his broader interest in music and music education as a former chairman of the board of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, a trustee of Carnegie-Mellon University, and the initiator of Baldwin's innovative education programs and publications in the field of music.

THE EDUCATION OF THE PERFORMING MUSICIAN

LUCIEN WULSIN

You may wonder why Yale has invited me, an "auslander" from the "altogether uninhabited interior" of the country, to come and help participate in this seminar on the education of the performing musician. I do not really know how to answer that question nor indeed many other questions that have arisen in my mind regarding education and performing musicians.

Let me see, however, if I can tell you something of how I got here and of my interest in being here. First and obviously, I run a business. I am not an educator. My success or failure in my role is measurable. My standard is pragmatic and easily understood. If the business goes well, I

am acclaimed. If not, my performance comes to an end: I am booed off the stage.

Several years ago I was looking at some charts and figures on per capita purchase of musical instruments and I noticed that despite absolute growth in people, in income, and in consumption, there was not the same growth in the sale of keyboard musical instruments. Why not?

We know, for example, that 85 percent of the people who buy pianos are between the ages of 30 and 40, with children between the ages of six and ten. I asked myself, "Why was little Suzie not taking piano lessons anymore?"

At about the same time, as chairman of the board of The Cincinnati Symphony, I was looking at ticket sales in our 3,500 seat music hall. They were relatively stable. We have been giving school symphony concerts for at least 30 years with the idea that we were creating future audiences. Where are the Roses and Freddies of yesteryear? Where *have* all the flowers gone? Even a slightly faded Rose sitting in the balcony in row 7 is better than no Rose at all. If they are not sitting in the concert halls, where are they?

After pondering those dismal statistics, I made an absolute bore of myself for a year. Every place I went I buttonholed people: "Did you take music lessons when you were a child?" 85 percent yes. "Can you play a musical instrument now?" 90–95 percent no. Conclusion: Music teaching was the greatest failure in my generation's upbringing. Any music teacher who said "I can teach Suzie to play" was obtaining money under false pretenses. The acidulated middle-aged vestal who year after year took your and my parents' money under the guise of culture proved P. T. Barnum right.

Both personally and in terms of Baldwin's corporate survival and self-interest, I was curious whether this was necessary. We started an experimental music school with some interesting results. We also started a research project on how people in general learn music and whether there is an optimum age to learn the language of music just as there is an optimum age to learn a second language. This explains my interest in today's topic.

We are here to dissect the performing musician and find out how to educate him: I am not going to talk about limited job opportunities, types of performing musicians, or growing numbers of graduates from liberal arts colleges who are majoring in music. I am certain you have heard this "ad nauseam." I do, however, ask you to ponder with me some questions to which there may or may not be answers.

What is a performing musician? Who is he? Why do we need him? The answers are not as simple as they may seem. This group may have a better insight than I. So here are some obvious questions to which I hope this group can find answers in the next two days. If Yale is going to educate a performing musician, we should be able to state:

(1) "Who he is"

(2) "What he can expect to be"
(3) "What skills and techniques we can expect him to have" and
(4) "What repertoire we reasonably can expect him to have"

Who Is a Performing Musician?

I am not certain I am able to describe exactly a performing musician. People like Andre Watts, Beverly Sills, and Leonard Bernstein, are obvious. But how about Danny Kaye conducting an orchestra (you know he cannot read a note of music) or Erroll Garner (he cannot either)? How about Arlo Guthrie, Joan Baez, or Marlene Dietrich? How about the Sunday choir singer or the Saturday night cafe instrumentalist? Is anyone who performs music in public for money a performing musician? Is money the test?

Must he be a traditional instrumentalist? I hope not. Instruments are the product of a technical society. They are after the fact. Whether they are a piece of cowhide stretched over a hollow log or whether they be beyond the state of our present art, such as a polyphonic synthesizer with ultimate gradations in rhythm, pitch, intonation, timbre, etc., is really irrelevant to the performing musician. A good one has a message to communicate, an experience to share. He must have something to say to his audience.

I doubt in our deliberations we will conclude that a performing musician is necessarily a technical specialist. He is not necessarily the fastest man on the "88." But must he be an artist with highly sensitized feelings and deep emotional involvement with his art? Historically, a performing musician was identified with a social, religious, or economic activity. He went with troops into battle. He performed in the fields, on the ocean, in holy places. He was an integral part of ceremony and ritual. He recorded the great and memorable events of his culture. When William of Normandy invaded England in 1066, one of his leading knights was his *chansonnier,* who rode into battle with his harp singing the "Chanson de Roland." This seems a far cry from the artist of today.

In the term performing musician, great emphasis is placed on the word "performing" as opposed to some other type of musician. I have some difficulty in visualizing a musician who is not a performer. If music is a language, it must be heard to be effective. The number of people who can communicate with each other solely through written music are few and far between. By definition a musician is a performer. To teach, you have to perform. To compose, you have to perform.

Yet, there is an idea, fuzzy on the edges though it may be, in the category "performing musician." Let us see if we can define it more clearly during the course of the day. I admit my bias in terms of money. It is a clear, unambiguous quantification. A performing musician is one who receives money for performing music in public.

What Can He Expect to Be?

Assuming we can agree on who he is in 1973, we should also have some idea on what he can expect to be. This means projecting our own minds into what the world will be like ten to twenty years from now. Where will he perform? When will television supplant the live performance? If Allan Miller's creation of Ravel's *Bolero* for TV is a precursor, the role of the performing musician will be substantially altered. How many symphony orchestras will be left to provide employment for the classically trained musician? How many classical recordings will be made? What is the point in having one more recording of the Tchaikovsky First Piano Concerto?

If you feel that we have too many unresolved questions floating around, let us try a few more. Will video tapes supplant records and commercial TV by 1984? Will the country, blue grass, and Western musicians continue to dominate the air waves from Nashville, Tennessee? Will jazz and rock survive as live expressions of what people think and feel, or will the Lawrence Welk of 1984 play jazz and rock as a trip down memory lane?

Assuming we arrive at 1984 ensconced in our posturepedic chaise before our six-foot screen in three dimension live color surrounded by four directional stereo, will we want to see a new video tape of the latest graduating class of music at Yale performing a restaged 525th version of *Lucia* or replay a reissued one of Beverly Sills at her peak? I mean by this question to put the spotlight on the plight of the living performing musician when you can hear the best of the past with the flick of a switch.

If I have to answer my own questions, I think as an act of faith that there will be a demand for, and there will be an audience for, those musicians who are performing today's music or rather contemporary music of their times: If the "leisure world" is at our doorstep, then our audiences are multiplied manyfold. In our highly mobile society, the Woodstock, Monterey, and Newport music festivals are in their infancies. The brass ring of opportunity will be grasped by those creative developers who understand how to reach these audiences.

What Techniques or Skills Can We Expect a Performing Musician to Have?

Rather than pose a series of questions, let me state affirmatively that we should expect proficiency on one or more instruments, including the voice. This means that you should be able to read, sight-read, play by ear, compose and transpose, and perform solo and in groups. There are a surprising number of professional musicians who today cannot do this. There are a number here who will say, "Look, it's hard enough to become proficient on one instrument, let alone two. If they are going to make a living as a performer, they have to be a star in their specialty, they don't have time to glop around sight-reading or transposing from one key to another." I am not going to argue this point now, except to point out that if you specialize exclusively, you may become so refined as to extinguish

yourself. Traditional musical instruments as we know them evolved from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Then they stood still until the electronic explosion of the past ten to fifteen years. These are now also in their infancy. Their range, expressiveness, pitch, and timbre are waiting to be explored.

What Repertory Can We Expect a Performing Musician to Have?

I touched earlier on the original role of a performing musician as the repository, critic, and exponent of his society's culture. This has not died, nor should it. It is a great role. It has much to do with the role of music as a language, as a vehicle to crystallize and transfer the communication of abstract ideas, emotions, and feelings. For many of us here, music is embodied in the classical tradition handed down and developed over the centuries. Yet we may be speaking a dead language, a musical mandarin, a language for the elite to converse one with the other. For reasons well known to you, Latin was for centuries a universal language. The ability to speak or write it was a badge of the educated man. A friend of mine, who was a distinguished member of the French diplomatic service, told me that his education consisted of writing essays in French, then translating them into Latin, then translating the Latin back into French, endlessly. He was a great public speaker. But who today can speak Latin? Who writes plays in Latin? Who composes love poems in Latin? Is there an analogy to classical music? Should we train performers to a repertory that is static and of other times? What is the point in endlessly reiterating in concert and recital the programs of the classical past? If I never heard another *Bohème* or Beethoven's Fifth or Tchaikovsky's Sixth, I doubt that my musical experience would be impoverished. Does it not say something for the state of our music that the social protest and anti-war sentiment of the past decade has scarcely surfaced into the repertoire of our "serious musicians"? Our popular street singers and composers and performers have led the way in calling attention to the destruction of spirit, the injustice, and the misery that our society endures. The Pete Seegers and the Bob Dylans are folk heroes in the lineage of our musical heritage. Their language and their music has an appeal and an audience far beyond the continental limits of the United States. Theirs is not an elite language limited to a few cognoscenti. Can you be both classical and popular in your repertoire? Why not?

A week ago Saturday, I heard a performance of Kurt Weill's Second Symphony. I had never heard it before. I was interested and pleased: the style was late romantic. Kurt Weill was a great figure in music — popular, classic, honest, contemporary, satiric. He certainly never spoke in a dead or archaic language. There was recently in Washington a revival of his music drama "The Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagony." As you know, Bertolt Brecht wrote the text. Its showstopper, "Alabama Song," was sung in English. The refrain still haunts us:

Oh! Moon of Alabama,
We now must say goodbye,
We've lost our good old mama
And must have dollars
Oh, you know why, you know why, you know why!

I do not know whether this could be otherwise titled "The Classical Performing Musician's Lament." But in any event it is now my time to say goodbye, to return to my dollars and to ask you to find the answers — you know why.

* * * * *

Mr. Wulsin's speech was followed by an ice-breaking discussion that quickly revealed the delegates' concern for tailoring the education of the performer to the needs of the audience of the future. What are the implications of the growth in record sales in classical music? Does it toll a death knell for live performance? What is the responsibility of the media corporations in fostering serious music? Is the full potential audience for this music being served? Given the dominance of the media and its dominance by the larger consuming public, must the performing musician be trained to compete in all the musics outside the standard repertory? Do we re-educate the performer to serve this larger audience or re-educate the audience to appreciate and demand the kind of music the serious performer is most interested in performing? What kinds of music can be called "serious" in this context? It was evident from these questions that a kind of consumerism — the healthy interrelationship of performer and audience — would inform all the discussions that were to take place during the two days.

Plenary Session II

THE INCREASING DEMAND FOR VERSATILITY

The four members of this panel, Bethany Beardslee, Richard Clark, Stephen Sell, and Sheldon Soffer, with moderator Robert Werner of the Contemporary Music Project, were able to interpret the performer's need for versatility from quite disparate backgrounds. To Bethany Beardslee, who for years has sung from the ramparts of avant-garde music, versatility meant the flexibility needed as a performer which she had to teach herself. Her own preparation had been deficient in twentieth-century technique and repertoire and she feared that today's students were being left with the same handicaps to overcome. Without a solid grounding in the "twentieth-century classics," she felt, we could be opening an unbridgeable gap in the ability of performers to perform music of their own time.

To Richard Clark of Affiliate Artists versatility meant the ability to relate to an audience as a person as well as an artist. Any music can be performed before a Rotary Club if done with conviction and skill by artists who have developed a "performing personality." Young performers, he suggested, must be trained "to convey their art to the public."

To Stephen Sell, manager of the itinerant St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, versatility meant the ability to perform different kinds of music in different size ensembles before different types of people in the most different kinds of setting. There is a potential for performance in every place people gather, and the performer of the future must be trained to seize that opportunity. When players in the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra are auditioned, they are heard in solo performances of music from the standard and contemporary repertory. They are also asked to sit in with a chamber group and to give a lecture on one of a variety of subjects, the latter test certainly not one encountered in the auditions of most symphony orchestras. About a third of the musicians in the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra have neither a conservatory nor a university background.

To concert manager Sheldon Soffer, versatility meant answering the demands of the communities and institutions that are looking for more than a walk-on recital from today's concert artists. They are asked to perform eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and twentieth-century repertoire with equal authority, and often they are asked to stay around for classes and lectures to discuss their approach to their art. Even though the larger names are sold as specialists, they must be prepared to function well in many styles of performance.

Questions to the panelists indicated a concern on the part of some delegates that solid programs of preparation would be sacrificed in an effort to make all performers Renaissance Men, "without giving them a Renaissance," as a student reporter pointed out. Would the versatility embodied in comprehensive musicianship lower standards of instrumental performance by dissipating the talent within each individual, or would it allow a flowering of creative energy through cross-pollinization? Pianist Claude Frank tried to mediate by suggesting that performers must allow themselves to become emotionally specialized while adding breadth to their whole musical background, so that the catholicity of a student's musical education both develops from and relates to his central interest.

Plenary Session III

PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIPS IN THE ARTS

If tomorrow's performers will need a different kind of training in order to operate creatively and successfully in the real-world music market, one

way they could get this experience is through pre-professional internships in the field.

William Porter, dean of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology School of Architecture, who was invited to talk about his school's internship program, admitted that the idea runs counter to the concept of the university as an institution that can economize on experience. The anomaly of field work in a university setting, he said, was somewhat reduced by insisting that the field work be carried on concurrently with classwork and not as a substitute for it.

The advantages of internships, at least for MIT architecture students, had proved to be three-fold: Skills were being acquired that the university simply could not teach. Professional entry was facilitated by the students' association with established firms. And through the program, the university was able to let the students become involved in beneficial social change.

In the process of the internship, the students were able to acquire process skills and situational skills to complement the knowledge dispensed in their courses. But there were still some problems to be worked out. Internships involved the university in obligations to the professionals in the field that helped train their students. Whether the students themselves, through their assistance, were able to repay these obligations was a source of some concern. Another concern was whether the university, through its students, should be providing lower quality service to a community simply because it can afford no better. From an educational standpoint, is it wise to allow students on internships to assume leadership roles that don't reflect their present ability or what they would achieve within established firms? And does the immediate situational response engendered by internships encourage students to adopt a short-term, non-permanent approach to problems of the profession?

A second address by Howard Stein, dean of faculty and students of the Yale School of Drama, discussed the advantage of designing a professional arts program around a visionary idea of what the profession should be doing. This is what Robert Brustein had done with the Yale Drama School when he took over as dean. Each year the preparation of three productions of legitimate theater serves as the basis of Yale's whole drama program. The plays are chosen with a point of view, and the students are trained narrowly. "We don't serve the whole country with our drama," Stein said, "but with the people we produce."

In recommending that music schools develop a point of view of their own, Stein warned that without a visionary approach the technicians would take over. The importance of undissipated inspirational leadership was paramount, for "as much has to be caught as taught."

DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Forum participants were divided into four discussion groups. Their charge was to develop the ideas presented in the three plenary sessions and

to formulate position statements and, especially, recommendations for further action by university music schools and conservatories.

A summary of the discussions of each group and their recommendations follows.

Discussion Group A

The members of Discussion Group A (George Houle, *chairman,* Thomas Fay, Robert Glidden, Roger Hall, William Ivey, Sheldon Soffer, Billy Taylor, Robert Trotter, and Nancy Kovaleff, *reporter*) touched on issues ranging from the global to the picayune. They arrived at the opinion that the current repertory considered to have "culturally redeeming value" is but a small segment of the world of music and one that is limited geographically, temporally, and sociologically. Our ethnocentric approach, it was felt, relegates the music of other cultures to the level of exotic curiosities. At the same time, we downgrade music of our own culture, such as jazz, blues, and country music. We further limit our repertory by emphasizing the classics and neglecting contemporary music. Rather than directing itself to all people, the "official" music of our culture is intended for an educated elite, and this results in the "musical mandarinism" Lucien Wulsin decried in the Forum's opening session.

The group agreed that so limited a repertory is not only inadequate, but also inappropriate. If the performing musician is to be an exponent of his culture, as he has been in the past, he must have a broader repertory reflecting the variety of today's musical life. Both performers and audiences are indoctrinated with a hierarchy of values. This hierarchy, the group agreed, should be turned on its axis to become a spectrum of values in order to foster a more vital tradition and a truly comprehensive culture.

Such a re-orientation involves the audience as much as the performer. It was stressed that educational institutions should be concerned not just with the training of performers, but with the creation of a music-loving audience. They should seek to provide maximum exposure and non-biased presentation of *all* types of music. Those in teaching and administrative roles must go beyond personal æsthetic boundaries, or their instruction becomes indoctrination rather than education.

The group predicated its discussion upon the needs of the average performer. The "superstar" often finds it difficult to fit into a conventional program because of extraordinary self-motivation or personal goals the school cannot anticipate. Despite our implicit belief in the musical leadership of an elite, our commitment is to mass education. In pedagogy as well as in repertory, we must substitute a spectrum for a hierarchy.

There is too little cultivation of basic musical skills and too little preparation for actual survival in the musical world. There should be a more thorough training in fundamental musical mechanics such as sight-singing, ear-training, improvisation, and tuning.

In addition, there should be some training in cable television, the re-

cording industry, and the like. Guidance concerning the media is essential in this technological age, and so also is instruction in commercial techniques. Today's performer simply cannot afford to be naïve in these matters if he is to survive.

After the Plenary Session report on professional internships by William Porter of MIT, the group agreed upon the desirability of such internships as a way for the student to get a taste of the real world and learn the practical side of his profession: how to draw up contracts and how to work with fellow performers; the practical necessities of concert arrangements, programming, and copying music; the details of showmanship, such as stage poise, dress, and the creation of an image; and all the other onerous, yet necessary aspects of professional life. Most important, a student's close work with professionals in the field, it was felt, would help sharpen his musical skills as well as expose him to the exigencies of the professional life.

Summarizing the above ideas, Group A produced the following two statements:

I. We believe that excellence can be found in all musical repertories and activities, and that exposure to these is essential to the education of a musician.

II. We recommend that schools use the best available resources for apprenticeship experiences to the following ends:
   A. for observing and interacting with the professional world,
   B. for further developing professional skills, and
   C. as a vehicle for professional entry.

Frequent cooperation between departments and schools of music was thought to be most desirable. This could be cultivated by joint productions in which performers, scholars, teachers, critics, technicians, and agents participated. Nevertheless, it was suggested that distinctions between departments of music and schools of music be retained. Although students enrolled in separate branches may not differ in interests, their priorities are different and fusion might result in confusion.

The apprenticeship arrangement might or might not be under the auspices of a university. If an institution were involved, it could offer its students even more by pooling its talent resources with those of other universities. The specialists cooperatively hired could not only teach by the example of their careers, but also help to place the students within the profession.

Discussion Group B

Discussion Group B (Gideon Waldrop, *chairman*, Samuel Adler, Roger Englander, Sidney Harth, Natalie Hinderas, John Mauceri, Philip Nelson, Harvey Phillips, and Caitriona Bolster, *reporter*) focused on two key issues: (1) the expansion of the abilities of the performing musician, and

(2) the need for musicians to see alternative careers in music and for musical institutions to expose their students to those alternatives.

Allowing that there would always be room for a number of highly specialized concert artists, the group seemed unanimous in the view that music schools can no longer limit themselves to turning out performers in the traditional sense. Instead, they must seek to increase the range of things the performing musician can do by: (1) enlarging his repertory (particularly in contemporary music); (2) instilling in him a willingness to relate to repertories other than his own; (3) equipping him with technical skills that will enable him to cope with diverse styles and repertories; and (4) attuning him to society's needs, encouraging his involvement with the community, and gearing him to accept performance platforms other than the concert stage.

A few members stressed the importance of verbal communication as a means by which the performer can stimulate audience involvement. Others pointed to such intangible, non-musical factors as "personality," "professional pride," "spirit of friendship and cooperation with fellow musicians," which, although unteachable, are a vital asset to the performing artist.

There was grave concern over the way in which musicians have "painted themselves into a corner" by their reluctance to explore all aspects of their profession. It was generally agreed that music schools are doing students an injustice both by admitting too many who are under-qualified and by denying those admitted adequate exposure to alternative outlets for their talent. Schools must aim for a better distribution of talent by informing students of the realities ahead and by offering those who are not going to make the grade as performers some genuinely satisfying alternatives. At least two ways in which schools might do this were suggested: by expanding their present limited contact with the commercial musical world, and by raising pre-college music education from the level of a "back-up career" for the second- or third-rate performer (which is how the group felt it was viewed) to that of a challenging alternative for the really talented musician.

Exactly how broad a curriculum should be in order to meet current needs of performers was not decided by the group. Some favored the individually tailored curriculum ideal, while recognizing its economic implications. Others held to the view that a school must be able to do a few things very well, and that no school should attempt to be all things to all people. There was an evident reluctance in some quarters to admit the popular commercial repertories within the walls of the conservatory or music school. Some felt it was impossible to devise a curriculum that included jazz, rock, country and western, jingle writing, and the like. Others adopted the view that they were simply unteachable while one or two showed a clear disdain for repertories beyond the pale of Western art music. All, however, seemed to support the notion of a somewhat broader curriculum and a more flexible approach, *provided this did not entail a lowering of standards.*

The recommendations the group drafted and submitted at the final plenary session are the following:

I. That a more realistic appraisal of the professional potential of the music student be implemented, and that there be a greater reassessment of the commercial alternatives open to the professional musician.

II. That each institution examine that which it does best and concentrate on those areas; that each institution have an open mind to *all* music; that it recognize and identify those musical disciplines it cannot teach, and that it encourage and assist students by means of symposium-workshops and/or lecture-performances to explore those areas.

III. That those institutions which offer a degree in music education be more selective regarding the performance and teaching potential of students admitted to that program. That the curriculum of the music education major be pared down, and that a greater number of accomplished musicians *who love to teach* be encouraged to seek careers in music education.

Some of the tangential matters discussed by the group (early music education; musicians, the media, and the music industry) simply highlighted the extent to which performers and their educational institutions need a broader perspective on the musical world at large. It was not the sense of the group, however, that music schools and conservatories should embark forthwith on an educational rampage, instituting colossal curricula, dissolving boundaries between disciplines, or negating the specialist. It was, however, suggested that schools might broaden their concerns to include the morale and attitudes of students past and present. For instance, they might devise ways (summer workshops, etc.) of "recharging the batteries" of the jaded symphony musician who hates music—everyone in the group seemed to know at least one or two! — or might instill professional pride in those who are forced to settle for something less than they had bargained for.

To the members of Discussion Group B, creating a "versatile" performer was not a matter of producing a musical factotum. Rather, it entailed developing the student's strengths and at the same time conveying a flexible attitude toward all areas of music and modes of performance, thus maximizing his professional options. Above all, they emphasized "attitude-shaping," not drastic curricular expansion.

Discussion Group C

There was general agreement among members of the group (Richard Clark, *chairman,* Herbert Barrett, Bethany Beardslee, Milton Fruchtman, Charles Mark, Robert Morris, Benjamin Patterson, Ray Robinson, and Peter Horn, *reporter*) that today's performing musician exists in and must adapt to a society undergoing considerable and rapid change.

Vastly increased accessibility and decentralization brought about by television, radio, and the burgeoning recording industry have made more people aware of a greater variety of experiences. Audience expectations have been significantly altered by both the products disseminated by and the manner of their presentation in the various media. Although the precise nature of the impact was difficult to define, the group noted a number of possible effects, including a greater need for a variety of stimuli, increased visual orientation, a smaller average span of attention, a tendency towards informality, and satisfaction with uncomplicated, readily enjoyable products. Traditional European art music, while obviously still widely accepted, is not the repertory most salable in the United States today, and the professional performer trained exclusively in this tradition faces growing competition.

While not denying the importance for success of certain qualities apparently independent of academic training — native talent, charisma, or a sense of purpose — the group agreed that educational institutions could do more to help the student performer prepare himself to meet the challenges of today's society, and various measures were recommended. First, these institutions must educate the whole musician, providing a broader education beyond technical excellence on a given instrument. Second, there should be greater emphasis on communication with the public; the student should perform more often, and be able to talk intelligently about all facets of music. Such contact may be accomplished through semiprofessional concerts not only within the institutional environment, but also outside it, before the public at large. Increased concert experience would also benefit the musician by promoting greater confidence, by helping to define his role as a performer, and by reconciling ideals with reality at an early stage in his career. The concert experience remains unique in today's world, for the particularly human bond that can arise between musician and audience in a live situation is noticeably lacking in the estranged and often superhumanly perfect performances presently obtainable from the electronic media. Third, student performers should be made more aware of the business of art, including money and marketing matters. The student should be actively exposed to the spectrum of ways of earning a living as a performing musician in today's society. These alternatives ought to be provided as early as possible so that the performer will not be locked into a narrow or ill-suited career involuntarily or through ignorant choice. Furthermore, these options should be kept available as "escape hatches" for as long as is feasible. Teachers should evaluate the student honestly and on a continuing basis to help him determine where his true talents lie and how best to take advantage of them. Such guidance ought to be supplemented when possible by direct contact with working professionals in the performer's areas of interest through extended workshops or long-term residencies.

The recommendations of Group C follow:

I. The sense of the group is that the education of the performing musician needs to be responsive to the continuing changes occurring in the society. Among the urgent needs in musical education is greatly increased cross-communication between students preparing performing careers and every sector of the professional field. Field work is important for the performing student, but it is also important and sometimes probably more efficient to bring resource professionals into the academic process.

II. The group also endorses the objectives of CMP, and believes that if these objectives were pursued and realized, many of the major problems that have come under discussion in the past two days would be satisfactorily resolved.

Discussion Group D

The group (Arthur Custer, *chairman,* Robert Bloom, Igor Buketoff, Guy Duckworth, Stephen Sell, Jonathan Tunick, William Waite, and Maury Yeston, *reporter*) dealt specifically with what it regarded as the central problem in the education of the performer: The demands made on the performer in the course of his professional life. To define those demands, the committee focused on the two most common areas of employment — the world of classical orchestral performance and the commercial complex of television, film, and recording.

Present educational opportunities were found wanting in both areas. It was argued that the failure of today's orchestra to find a large, adventurous audience is due partly to a lack of sympathy between the performer and the public. Such sympathy comes about less easily in the formality of the concert hall than in the more personal context of a chamber concert in the community or in the visit to a school of a personable and exciting soloist. The conservatory or large university music department is the logical place for initial experience in outward-directed performance, as well as for good training in solo and small and large ensembles. This training, it was suggested, would make performing musicians more secure about playing in exposed ensembles as part of their full-year service contracts, which in most cases now severely limit the ways performers can be assigned to smaller ensembles.

Many performers emerging from conservatories and universities, it was felt, are ill prepared for commercial work. Their familiarity with the business practices was evaluated as insufficient, and a lack of pre-professional experience with things such as playing before a microphone or playing with a click track was noted, as was the lack of training in the kind of improvising the performer might be expected to do on a commercial job. The blame for these inadequacies was laid on the prejudices of the academic

community against certain kinds of music and on a past failure to reconcile those prejudices with the exigencies of the kind of employment some students may choose to seek. It was argued that the general populace would have its music and its performing musicians with or without the conservatory, and that the institutions of higher education could serve the needs of our society only if they were willing to prepare their students to enter and transform that broader world.

In light of this discussion and evaluation, Group D made the following general recommendation:

> We believe that the question of the performer's diversity or specialization is academic, since the duty of the educational institution is to analyze the real-life challenge the professional performing musician encounters and to provide the educational experience necessary to meet that challenge. It is also incumbent upon the educational institution to undertake continuing analyses of the professional performer's environment and to modify the educational program accordingly. The basic goal is the development of musicianly people whose abilities may be manifested in performance.

It was the last line of this recommendation that received the most discussion. All agreed that music and musicality came first, that teaching an instrument must be equally the teaching of music and the evocation of intrinsically musical responses.

The committee further specified four ways to augment the present training program of the performer.

(1) We feel the educational program should embrace opportunities for performing in the community and the public media outside the walls of the institution.

To implement this proposal it was suggested that the solo recital might be played for a local Rotary Club or church group, rather than for the usual audience of fellow students. Visits to schools were also encouraged, with the hope that public relations work can offset the resistance that music teachers typically offer such projects.

(2) Experiences with facets of the music profession which extend beyond the conventional forms and repertoires should be provided, such as practical application of devices, techniques, and materials in the popular, folk, and commercial areas — including television, film, and recording.

(3) Practical information and experience regarding the business of professional music should be provided, concerning such things as management, promotion, royalties, fund-raising, unions, and legislation.

Both of these proposals address themselves to the development of

professional "savvy" and the broadening of the performer's experience. It was suggested that learning to play one kind of music well can only help the performer to play other kinds well — that is, help to make him a good musician — and that these options ought to be available to him.

(4) The education of the performing musician should embrace opportunities for learning and experiences which go beyond the traditional curriculum. These may take the form of alternate situational models, such as internships with symphony orchestras, or chamber groups, commercial productions, television, films, etc.; and visiting specialists, consultants' seminars, and the use of other professional resources invited to the institution.

This proposal urges the establishment of alternate learning situations. As examples, the committee universally hailed the master class as a form of instruction. The Denver Symphony was cited as one of many orchestras that allow students to sit-in and double with the players during a residency program. Although professional studio experience was not a likely possibility for the student, it was thought that its simulation was desirable.

Finally, the committee undertook to elucidate the philosophy by which it made its recommendations and to list them as general goals.

> We feel that the implications of these recommendations are: open-mindedness, flexibility, adaptability to change, avoidance of snobbism, the development of attitudes that can discern quality while avoiding prejudices often associated with some musical categories, and the making of the musical experience a humanizing one.

Summary

Philip F. Nelson, Dean
Yale School of Music

The Forum at Yale took a hard look at the ways in which performing musicians are presently being educated — and the delegates were critical of what they saw.

It was especially significant, I think, that the Yale Forum brought together so many members of the music profession whose breadth of expertise within the profession (representatives from: artists management, radio, television, press, foundations, orchestras — in addition to university faculty members) made possible such a lively exchange of ideas.

Principal among their concerns was an examination of the demands placed upon the professional performing musician — by the profession, and the ways in which American institutions of higher (musical) education do, or do not, prepare their students to meet the realities of this demanding profession.

Beginning with Lucien Wulsin's thoughtful and challenging keynote address, members of the Forum were asked to consider the performing musician in terms of:

— his identity

— his expectations within the profession

— the skills and techniques he will need to flourish

— the repertoire which he will be expected to know.

In accepting Mr. Wulsin's suggestions that professionals need to solidly frame their performance careers on the basic tenets of comprehensive musicianship, as refined by the actual need of the profession itself, Forum members were especially concerned that the institutions charged with the responsibility for the education of the performing musician re-examine both their educational programs and their educational philosophy to ascertain if:

— the education of the performer takes into account the needs and requirements of the audience of the future, and stresses the dimensions of both *specialization* and *versatility*.

— curricular programs and the musical ambiance of the institution seek to provide maximum exposure (and hopefully non-biased presentation) to *all* types of music.

— the curriculum rigorously insists upon the student's acquisition of basic musical skills — and encourages the integration of these skills throughout the total educational program.

— opportunities are being created for close association with practicing professionals in the field — through apprenticeship/internship programs.

— a realistic appraisal of the professional potential of the music student is made, and if there is also a continuing reassessment of the commercial alternatives available to the performing musician.

— it is always the *quality* of the educational program that is of paramount importance, rather than the numbers of students enrolled in any particular program.

— students are informed of the realities ahead and whether those who are not qualified as professional performers are offered some genuinely satisfactory alternatives within the the music profession.

In sum then, the members of the Yale Forum were very much concerned that the "Education of the Performing Musician" be solidly grounded within the framework of a rigorous comprehensive musicianship program which is broad and deep — and which is constantly in touch with the real demands of the profession itself.

The tendency to drift toward "musical mandarinism" evident in many institutionalized music programs must be stopped. Indeed the language of

our musical programs must be greatly broadened and the tide reversed. To ignore the critical dimensions of the situation we face is to turn a deaf ear to Kurt Weill's song:

> Oh! Moon of Alabama,
> We now must say goodbye,
> We've lost our good old mama
> And must have dollars
> Oh, you know why, you know why, you know why!

REPORT

THE GRADUATE EDUCATION OF COLLEGE MUSIC TEACHERS

An Invitational Forum

SPONSORED BY

THE CONTEMPORARY MUSIC PROJECT

IN COOPERATION WITH

THE CENTER FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSIONS

AND

THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

JANUARY 22-23-24, 1973

Copyright ©

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MUSIC
Evanston, Illinois 60201

All rights reserved including the right to reproduce
this book or parts thereof in any form.

CONTENTS

Agenda 61

Participants 62

Introduction 64

Forum Papers

Current Status of Graduate Programs and the Need for More Versatility in Graduate Studies — Himie Voxman 65

NASM Basic Musicianship Statement 68

Implications of the NASM Basic Musicianship Statement for the Preparation of College Teachers — Robert Glidden 69

The Administrator's Role in the Reorientation and Utilization of Faculty — Robert M. Trotter 73

The Role of the Music Administrator — Eugene Bonelli 77

Discussion and Recommendations 80

An Expanded View of Specialization 80

Attitudes Toward Teaching 81

Graduate Programs 82

Evaluation 83

Summary 84

AGENDA

MONDAY, JANUARY 22

PLENARY SESSION I

1:30–3:00	Introductions — Thomas Miller, Chairman Greetings — Raymond W. Mack, Vice-President and Dean of Faculties, Northwestern University Statement of Purpose — Robert J. Werner Current Status of Graduate Programs and the Need for More Versatility in Graduate Students—Himie Voxman Implications of the NASM Basic Musicianship Statement for the Education of College Music Teachers — Robert Glidden Discussion
3:30–5:00	Discussion Groups
8:15	Concert of Ensemble Music

TUESDAY, JANUARY 23

9:00–10:30	Discussion Groups

PLENARY SESSION II

11:00–12:30	Robert J. Werner, Chairman Reorientation and Utilization of Faculty — Claude Mathis The Administrator's Role in the Reorientation and Utilization of Faculty — Eugene Bonelli and Robert Trotter
2:00–4:00	Discussion Groups

PLENARY SESSION III

8:00	Everett Timm, Chairman Reports of Discussion Group Chairmen Reactions by Representatives of American Musicological Society, Charles Hamm College Music Society, Walter Collins Music Educators National Conference, Charles Benner Music Library Association, William J. Weichlein Music Teachers National Association, Albert Huetteman Society for Ethnomusicology, Barbara Smith

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24

9:00–10:30 Discussion Groups

PLENARY SESSION IV

11:00 Edward F. D'Arms, Chairman
Presentation of Group Recommendations
Summary and Adjournment

PARTICIPANTS

Charles Ball, Director, School of Music, George Peabody College for Teachers
Wayne Barlow, Director of Graduate Studies, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester
Grant Beglarian, Dean, School of Performing Arts, University of Southern California
Charles Benner, President Elect, MENC; College-Conservatory of Music, University of Cincinnati
Bruce Benward, Chairman, School of Music, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Eugene Bonelli, Chairman, Division of Music, Southern Methodist University
Andrew Broekema, Chairman, Department of Music, Arizona State University
C. Edward Brookheart, Coordinator of Graduate Studies, University of Texas
*Clifton Burmeister, Chairman, Music Education Department, Northwestern University
Walter Collins, President, CMS; Associate Dean, College of Music, University of Colorado
Edward F. D'Arms, CMP Policy Committee
Jon Engberg, Chairman, Division of Music, West Virginia University
Thomas Fredrickson, Director, School of Music, University of Illinois
Robert Glidden, Executive Secretary, NASM
Thomas Gorton, Dean, School of Fine Arts, University of Kansas
Charles Hamm, President, AMS; University of Illinois
Albert Huetteman, Executive Secretary, MTNA
Wiley Housewright, Dean, School of Music, Florida State University
Jan LaRue, Chairman, Department of Music, New York University
William Latham, Director of Graduate Studies, School of Music, North Texas State University
Harold Luce, Director, School of Music, Ohio State University
*Claude Mathis, Director, Center for Teaching Professions, Associate Dean, School of Education, Northwestern University

*Fred Miller, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, School of Music, Northwestern University
*Thomas Miller, Dean, School of Music, Northwestern University
Robert Morris, School of Music, Yale University
James Niblock, Chairman, Department of Music, Michigan State University
*Arland Parsons, Professor of Theory, School of Music, Northwestern University
*Jack Pernecky, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, School of Music, Northwestern University
Howard Rarig, Director, School of Music, University of Southern California
Barbara Smith, Representing SEM; Department of Music, University of Hawaii
William Thomson, CMP Policy Committee; Cleveland Institute of Music–Case Western Reserve University
Everett Timm, Acting President, NASM; Dean, School of Music, Louisiana State University
Robert Trotter, Dean, School of Music, University of Oregon
Himie Voxman, Director, School of Music, University of Iowa
Robert Warner, Associate Dean, School of Music, University of Michigan
Robert J. Werner, Director, Contemporary Music Project
William Weichlein, Executive Secretary, MLA; University of Michigan
David Willoughby, Assistant Director, CMP
Chappell White, Editor designate, *College Music Symposium;* Indiana University

REPORTERS

Doctoral Teaching Assistants,
Northwestern University School of Music

Emily Brink

Jerry Davidson

Morgan Jones

Larry Retzak

*Local Planning Committee

INTRODUCTION

The Contemporary Music Project established for 1972-73 a new program called Forums on Contemporary Musicianship. Two types were planned, one to deal with issues of national interest and one for local concerns. National Forums centered on discussions of such topics as the education of professional musicians, musical performances in contemporary society, and music in the education of general college students. Summaries of discussions and recommendations emanating from these Forums will be made available to the entire profession through professional publications.

These national Forums complement the second type: local Forums in specific communities. These Forums, organized by local planning committees, involved the three components of community musical life: the professional musician, the public school and college teacher, and the layman. Representatives of each of these segments were brought together to share common goals and concerns of various artistic and educational agencies, to determine how these goals and concerns relate to the education of the professional musician and layman, and to formulate recommendations for meeting these needs, particularly through the music curricula of area colleges and universities.

It could rightly be said that all of the Contemporary Music Project's programs and activities over the past several years have inevitably led to the topics being considered by these Forums. CMP felt that a search for means of effecting the development of values and a considered reappraisal of the profession must begin with the professional education of musicians. Thus it was not surprising that the first national CMP Forum should focus on the education, reorientation and influence of the college music teacher as a model and leader in the profession.

The selection of Northwestern University as a site for this particular Forum was not accidental. In addition to its having a nationally known School of Music (at which, in 1965, CMP held a Seminar that first articulated the concept of comprehensive musicianship), it has recently established a Center for the Teaching Professions as an adjunct to the School of Education, a Center committed to the improvement of teaching in *all* disciplines. As Claude Mathis, the Director of the Center, reminded the participants: teaching and scholarship must go hand in hand, for scholarship to be viable must be communicated. The Center has developed programs at Northwestern so that faculty members do not find themselves in alien situations in regard to pedagogy, but rather encourages them, through outstanding-teacher fellowships and other support, to pursue more imaginative teaching procedures. In addition, a seminar on college teaching has been initiated for graduate students to gain skills in communication as applied to their own discipline.

Many of the topics discussed and recommendations made at this Forum

might at first seem obvious. The graduate student's self-image, derived largely from his teachers who function as his models, served as part of the underlying tone of discussions, as did also the recognition that a graduate student does devote a great portion of his professional activities, after completing his graduate education, to some form of teaching.

The Forum presentations and recommendations can have important implications for both accreditation and consideration by administrators, faculty, and graduate committees. It was the hope of the participants that their position statements and recommendations might be a stimulus to the continued re-evaluation of graduate education in music.

Robert J. Werner, Director
Contemporary Music Project

CURRENT STATUS OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS AND THE NEED FOR MORE VERSATILITY IN GRADUATE STUDENTS

HIMIE VOXMAN

I have been asked to present a few informal remarks concerning the status of graduate music education — from the presumed vantage point of my membership on the Commission on Graduate Studies of the National Association of Schools of Music. Since we are not a data-gathering body my comments are in the category of personal impressions gleaned from proposals for new or modified graduate programs, self-survey reports, and visitations to institutions. It would be presumptuous of me to claim anything more than *impressions* because you at this Forum represent where the action is and are collectively better informed than any agency.

I believe it is obvious that graduate study in music has flourished these past few years. Music departments in most instances can now offer masters degrees with adequate music content, including degrees in music education — either because of a more benevolent attitude on the part of our education colleagues or by means of ingenious semantic maneuvers. Masters programs are also increasingly varied and less structured.

Since the chief concern here is the *education* of the *college* music teacher, let me turn to that. While the doctorate is fortunately not an absolute *sine qua non* for the college music teacher, as is the case in certain other fields, the growth of doctoral music education has been rapid. Although our data are far from complete and not wholly accurate, according to the NASM publication, *Music in Higher Education*, in the fall of 1965 approximately *37* member schools had almost *1,400* doctoral students enrolled. Only five years later *50* schools reported over *2,330* doctoral students. Although the future is cloudy with respect to graduate study, we shall probably not see a great decline in interest.

Our admissions office has just released an interesting bit of data on this year's entering freshman class. 27% indicate a hope of ultimately seeking a doctor's degree in some field or other. I should add, however, that the national norm for entering freshmen is 12%.

On the qualitative side we are grateful for the continuing financial support of faculty, physical plant, library, and audio materials as necessary to a strong doctoral program.

What is new in graduate music education? In all candor, it must be said that to a great extent the *winds of change* and the ferment that has recently characterized undergraduate music education *have pretty much bypassed the graduate area.* Graduate requirements are undoubtedly being constantly revised in the directions of flexibility, more emphasis on analysis, and more concern with contemporary and non-Western music; e.g., new areas of concentration are available in such specialties as opera. But on the whole it is difficult to observe any significant or radical change.

I do not believe that this apparent lack of change is cause for self-denigration. Institutions offering the Ph.D. in music have long enjoyed a high degree of autonomy with respect to content and structure. As long as we are able to offer curricula and patterns tailored to the previous training and experience of the candidate, we need not be too self-critical, provided, of course, that we keep up to date with the changing needs of society.

The remarkably rapid spread of availability of the Doctor of Musical Arts degree and its equally remarkably rapid acceptance nationally have solved what was a rather thorny problem only a few years ago. As the Graduate Commission sees it, the chief fly in this particular ointment is the increasing use of the D.M.A. as an umbrella to cover almost any field of concentration. As a result the true identity of the D.M.A. holder is now more than a little obscure in many instances. I must say, however, that we can sympathize with those institutions who have found the D.M.A. the best means of wresting control of curriculum from seemingly inimical forces.

To a great extent music has escaped the criticism leveled at other disciplines, especially the sciences, to the effect that orientation toward research has tended to produce a Ph.D. graduate ill-prepared to teach in two-year or four-year institutions. It may be true that some composition and musicology graduates lack high enthusiasm for freshman theory and music appreciation courses, and one could readily find a number of young artists-in-residence not enthralled by the prospect of teaching string techniques or freshman secondary piano. Even so, most doctoral students in music *expect* to teach and have reasonably well resigned themselves to accept the bitter with the sweet.

I should like to say a few words about the necessity of versatility in graduate students. This point of view makes me sound like an emissary from Luttons Music Personnel Service or the American College Bureau. As a matter of fact, the staffs of such organizations could much better document the case for versatility than I can. In any event, we are all aware

that the present relationship of college-teacher supply and demand is posing serious problems which have no near-term easy solutions. Placement officers in our area inform me that music is faring better than the other arts and much better than several other disciplines. Even so, schools of music are being obliged to teach more students without an increase in staff or even with fewer faculty. This pressure is perhaps more obvious in the studio area, where cost per credit hour is highest. Many schools are experimenting with various combinations of class and individual instruction.

Those students preparing for classroom teaching are also finding their services less in demand and are being called upon in some instances to add some studio or class teaching to their loads.

It would seem therefore that our doctoral graduates of the next few years will find rather rough going in securing positions that call for a high degree of specialization. By that I mean the oboe D.M.A. will be receiving job notices that ask for an oboe instructor who can teach saxophone, direct a stage band program, and cope with an ear training class. The prospective theory-composition teacher with a respectable keyboard competence will probably find himself more readily employable than his colleague without one.

The demand for versatility is not new, of course, but the necessity for it presently is much more obvious.

Just how are we to achieve this versatility? One avenue suggested is the Doctor of Arts degree. Its protagonists (mostly from the two-year and four-year institutions) have declared that traditional doctoral programs have tended to train narrow specialists often temperamentally unsuited for teaching in these kinds of schools. Requirements for the D.A. include at least one strong minor and a teaching intern or externship involving more responsibility than that usually exercised by teaching assistants. Research projects are tied in closely with the candidate's teaching area. While the degree has met with minimum acceptance by our member schools thus far, we should certainly examine it more closely, at least to see if its meritorious features can be incorporated into the more popular degrees.

By one means or another we are going to be obliged to see that our graduates are able to serve in more than one capacity. For some years, I have encouraged my own D.M.A. woodwind students to take such courses as *Methods of Teaching Basic Musicianship*. By coincidence or otherwise, a surprising number of them have been asked on their first job to teach lower level theory or music appreciation. While they may not have blazed any new trails, they have at least entered such classrooms with a degree of self-confidence not otherwise possible.

Obviously, we cannot afford to dilute areas of concentration to the point where the graduate leaves with only a superficial knowledge of a number of specialties. But it seems to me that most doctoral programs have sufficient room to permit the student to take enough courses in such subjects as non-Western music, the teaching of musicianship, and the inter-

relationship of music and the other arts to add to his potential as a faculty member.

Up to this point I have unavoidably stressed what might be viewed as a highly materialistic motivation for versatility. There is another (and I believe in the long run far more significant) side to the matter. Recently I had occasion to talk to some graduate students while visiting another school. One was not a theory-composition major but had a few non-required courses in the area. As a result he was assigned a lower level theory course to teach. He told me that the experience had been one of the most valuable in his entire college career — a genuine broadening of his musical horizons. It had given him a much-needed sense of what theory study could do for him as a performer.

Another reported that a course in music of non-Western nations had altered his whole attitude toward the *importance* of music in the life of man.

I feel very strongly that many courses now taken as a form of vocational insurance may in the long run give the student a breadth of musical vision and a sense of the wholeness of the musical experience that he might never have otherwise acquired.

Certainly the implementation of the NASM Basic Musicianship Statement is going to require a breadth of training in the college instructor that we have not always provided in the past.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

BASIC MUSICIANSHIP

All musicians, whether performers, composers, scholars, or teachers, share common professional needs. Every musician must to some extent be a performer, a listener, an historian, a composer, a theorist and a teacher. For this reason, certain subject matter areas and learning processes are common to all baccalaureate degrees in music. The precise format and details of the curricula utilized to achieve this breadth of skills and understandings are best determined by the individual institution in ways that are commensurate with its unique goals and resources.

Basic musicianship is developed in studies which prepare the student to function in a variety of musical roles which are supportive of his major concentration. All undergraduate curricula should, therefore, provide the following:

1. A conceptual understanding of such musical properties as *sound, rhythm, melody, harmony, texture* and *form;* and opportunities for developing a comprehensive grasp of their interrelationships as they form the cognitive-affective basis for listening, composing and performing.
2. Repeated opportunities for enacting in a variety of ways the

roles of listener (analysis), performer (interpretation), composer (creation) and scholar (research).

3. A repertory for study that embraces all cultures and historical periods.

The competencies suggested by these components might be developed in the traditional course sequence of sight-singing, ear training, harmony, keyboard, counterpoint, orchestration, conducting and music literature, or in studies which combine concepts and skills in an integrated approach.

This statement was presented to the NASM Board of Directors, the Executive Committee and the membership at their national convention in Boston, November 22–24, 1971, at which time it was unanimously approved for inclusion in the NASM Handbook under specific requirements for undergraduate degrees.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE NASM BASIC MUSICIANSHIP STATEMENT FOR THE PREPARATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

ROBERT GLIDDEN

Before addressing the implications of the NASM Basic Musicianship Statement for the preparation of college teachers, we should perhaps begin by reviewing the statement itself, from the *Handbook 1972*. The statement begins: "All musicians, whether performers, composers, scholars or teachers, share common professional needs. Every musician must to some extent be a performer, a listener, an historian, a composer, a theorist and a teacher. For this reason, certain subject matter areas and learning processes are common to all baccalaureate degrees in music." The Basic Musicianship Statement says, then, "let's get it all together" — it essentially asks that every musician become somewhat of a musical generalist in addition to his own specialized area. The statement goes on to say that the precise format and details of curricula are best determined by individual institutions, and then to outline several kinds of learnings and opportunities that undergraduate curricula should provide.

The Basic Musicianship Statement is a recent addition to the NASM *Handbook* and, presumably, it was added because the membership of the Association recognized a need for greater emphasis on the principles it espouses. Most of those who observe the work of our baccalaureate graduates would agree, I believe, that we have too seldom succeeded in developing "total" musicians. This is evident from the programs and objectives of those who become teachers, from the attitudes of those who enter the professional world as performers, and certainly we see evidence of it among our graduate students. But if we have not done as well as we would like in developing comprehensiveness, what is the source of the problem? It is easy enough to lay the blame on the curriculum and call for revision. But

curricula must be implemented by people — teaching faculty — and although some curriculum revision may be in order, no amount of restructuring can succeed if a faculty is not prepared for it.

One of the major problems to be recognized in college music teaching is the lack of acceptance of responsibility on the part of individual faculty members for the total, comprehensive musical education of their students. It seems that we have almost willingly relegated ourselves to what might be called an assembly-line process as we "produce" musicians. In fact, our fragmented way of doing things has become so ingrained that students become incensed when one faculty member ventures into another's "domain." Have you ever noticed the facial expression that says, "How dare you ask me about that — that's Professor So-and-so's subject!"? Or heard the response: "I didn't come prepared to talk about that here — we cover that in music history!"?

These ideas and ways of doing things are difficult and slow to change, mostly because our concepts about teaching and learning are derived from our own experiences, from the way we learned and were taught, and we almost refuse to question such long-standing procedures. But, if we really take the Basic Musicianship Statement seriously, we must emphasize to our graduate students, to those preparing to teach, that individual faculty members are responsible to their students for more than their special subject areas. We could encourage them, for example, to look at their own specific teaching areas from as many vantage points as possible — the music historian should be able to reflect on his subject as a theorist, as a performer, as an ethnomusicologist, as a layman; and certainly the performance teacher in the studio needs to be able to guide his students in analysis of the literature and to think like the historian in terms of performance practice, appropriate style, etc. This kind of teaching procedure can hardly be called innovative, but it is only the few outstanding teachers who proceed in this manner. The "comprehensive" approach is certainly not yet the norm. I wonder what percentage of performance teachers actually require their students to analyze the literature they perform, or how many music theorists teach analysis in a way that is functional for the young performer, or how many music historians put more emphasis on style and performance practice than on biographies and dates.

Every area within the music school has the opportunity, and responsibility, for helping students to integrate their music learnings. The historian or literature teacher who encourages student performance in class, using that performance as the vehicle for discussion about style, or the performance teacher who encourages analysis and historical research, each make the other's job infinitely easier, because they focus the student's attention on the importance of integrating learnings, and that in turn makes each special area more relevant. I doubt that such ideas are contrary to anyone's philosophy about the education of musicians, but faculty members, and most importantly, those preparing for teaching, need encouragement to

make the effort and to accept the responsibility for developing the total musician.

We have in the past made some faculty assumptions about the quality of teaching in higher education — we have assumed that because of (a) a high degree of specialized knowledge, and (b) zeal and enthusiasm for the subject, an individual is capable of excellence in teaching. These assumptions are not totally invalid because we can all agree that these things are necessary. We know, however, that they in themselves do not always produce excellence in teaching. Highly specialized knowledge in a given area without some understanding of its relative importance for the total education of the musician may produce little more than frustration, both for the student and for the teacher. And, enthusiasm for the specialized subject area, desirable as it is, may pre-empt cognizance of the importance of comprehensiveness and general understanding. Some faculty members, I fear, may be striving for the development of "mini-specialists" among their undergraduate students.

It is difficult in our times to mount an effective argument against specialization, because some immediately infer the argument to be against excellence, against progress, even against knowledge itself. However, to specialize before acquiring a general understanding of the field is to invite narrowness. We encounter numbers of graduate students who are narrow, both in their knowledges and attitudes, suggesting that we have some remedial work to do. Ostensibly, if we had accomplished the goal of comprehensiveness in undergraduate degree programs we could plan for and justify increased specialization in graduate studies. Since we cannot make such a claim, however, it seems important for the attainment of that objective in the future that we attend to unfinished business, in addition to specialization, as we prepare graduate students for college music teaching. We might begin by applying the Basic Musicianship Statement from the NASM *Handbook* to our graduate degree programs.

The Statement maintains that all undergraduate curricula should provide "a conceptual understanding of such musical properties as sound, rhythm, melody, harmony, texture and form, and opportunities for developing a comprehensive grasp of their interrelationships as they form the cognitive-affective basis for listening, composing and performing." Music doctoral programs treat analysis rather thoroughly and on a justifiably technical level, but should we not also equip our graduates with effective approaches for dealing with musical properties and their interrelationships on a more basic level for the college freshman or sophomore, or for the general college student? At advanced levels we tend to feel so comfortable about our understanding of what sound and music are that we no longer bother to define such basic terms for ourselves or for our students. To some, for example, the only acceptable musical sound is that produced in the traditional manner by a standard orchestral instrument or the human voice. And, unfortunately, the definition of form may be restricted to those

well-established structures that emanate from the late 18th and early 19th centuries. This relates to another provision of the Basic Musicianship Statement, that all undergraduate curricula should provide "a repertory for study that embraces all cultures and historical periods." I suspect that we produce many doctoral graduates who have, at best, a shallow knowledge of music since 1950, and many more who are totally unfamiliar with any but music of our Western culture.

I think it essential that we begin to take seriously at advanced levels the Basic Musicianship Statement. It is time for us to forego the idea that masterpieces of the literature are something to be knelt down before and begin to concentrate on the processes of music — how does it work? If we concentrate on universals that can be applied to all musics, then we needn't be ashamed to study jazz or rock seriously, or hesitant about studying music of other cultures.

I have suggested two implications of the NASM Basic Musicianship Statement for the education of college music teachers. The first concerned acceptance of responsibility by individual faculty members for helping students to integrate their music learnings. The second called for attention to the musical comprehensiveness of graduate students themselves, of those who are the future college music teachers. A third point must be made, although it does not derive directly from the Basic Musicianship Statement. I believe we must make the decision in graduate schools of music to produce teachers, not just performers or researchers. A recent Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Report stated that a third of the undergraduates and nearly half of the graduate students surveyed identified the lack of quality in classroom instruction as one of their major concerns. A serious problem, I believe, is that the reward system in higher education encourages excellence in scholarship, research, performance, but not in teaching. (In fact, we might even be cynical enough to say that it requires evidence of scholarship or research, but requires no evidence of satisfactory teaching.) Obviously, it is easier to recognize quality in research or performance than in teaching, but that does not excuse us from making a better effort. And while I believe that revision of the reward system would do much to focus the attention of faculty on teaching effort itself, it seems almost foolish to suggest that the greater percentage of teachers could or would improve their classroom performance without some outside direction. Faculty development programs, if properly guided, can do much to improve the situation. We must, however, direct ourselves to the future by doing more for graduate students preparing for the profession. We must convince them, first of all, that one *can* learn something about teaching and that any individual can improve his own teaching effectiveness if he is willing to open his mind and make the effort. And then, somehow, we must impart to them some ideas and attitudes that will help them to perform better in the classroom and studio. I propose that this be done through careful and conscientious supervision of graduate teaching assist-

ants, since we have that vehicle at our disposal and since it may be the most palatable form of this prescription for doctoral students in music.

Allow me to cite, briefly, some examples of the kind of guidance I believe we should give to graduate teaching assistants. First, we can insist that they define, preferably in writing, the objectives of each teaching task. The question of what is to be accomplished must be answered before determining how it is to be accomplished, and that is as appropriate for a daily lesson as for an entire course. Second, we can encourage them to give careful thought to what questions they will pose to students, and how they will be phrased. The stimulation of discussion is both a calculated science and a creative art and it is extremely important, particularly with today's students. Teachers need to think more about developing ways of inciting curiosity in their students. Third, the assistant will most likely need guidance in evaluating his students' achievement. How does achievement compare with the objectives? And fourth, he will also need guidance in evaluating his own performance, student achievement being one of the major criteria.

These suggestions are certainly not original; indeed, they are "old hat" to anyone who has studied the science of teaching. They are basically simple, requiring only some logical thinking and a little effort, but they are not in common use by college teachers today. Teaching is not only more productive but a great deal more fun when one is prepared. Whether preparation in teaching skills is to be done through informal consultation and guidance, required seminars, or through careful supervision of teaching assistants is, of course, a matter for each institution and faculty to consider, but we must in some way convince our graduate students in music that it is not shameful to be an educator; it is only shameful to be a poor one.

In closing, I hope you will forgive some generalities I may have made in the interest of making a point and stimulating discussion. And, lest I be misunderstood, let me repeat the desire and belief that we need not forsake the development of specialists in our doctoral programs in the interest of comprehensiveness, but that we must make our specialists more comprehensive in their attitudes and more aware of their responsibilities, in the interest of truly implementing the Basic Musicianship Statement from the NASM *Handbook*.

THE ADMINISTRATOR'S ROLE IN THE REORIENTATION AND UTILIZATION OF FACULTY

ROBERT M. TROTTER

There are two parts to my remarks: first, an attempt to define the context for the topic announced here in a series of personal position statements, a kind of poor man's *étalage de moi*, a spreading of myself on the counter in the spirit of Rousseau, if you will. And then, second, some direct

statements on how I believe an administrator can be engaged in changing a learning environment so that colleagues, including students and staff, will feel better and more useful.

Personal Position Statements as an Administrator

First of all, I believe there is considerable evidence of change in our culture on a much larger scale than any mere "generational reversal." It is imperative that we view our activities within this framework. It is downright irresponsible to say it is merely a "generation gap." The scope of the changes is great enough that we're all in it together, and the rather prevalent habit of *déjà vu* — you know, "We went through this in 1931 and it didn't work" — is an approach that is all too tempting and, in my view, a fundamental heresy. I believe it's a result of our continually focusing, as sheer survival mechanism, on microrhythms instead of macrorhythms. We are in a time when there is an overlapping of dying and birthing on a grand scale.

Second, just a week ago I came to my latest position on what it is to be in a bureaucratic environment. In my metaphor I have a horizontal whirl and a vertical whirl going on simultaneously: the horizontal is the "catch-the-brass-ring" aspect of bureaucracy; whatever you try to change, until you catch that brass ring, you've had it — because everything is completely interdependent in a bureaucracy. The vertical whirl is the "subordinate-superordinate" whirl: "If he or she would only do what he or she is *supposed* to do," or "If he or she would *not* do what they *are* doing at this moment, everything would be okay." That whirl goes on from the lowliest freshman and custodian up to the governor, at which point you're back to the people who elect the governor, who are the parents of our freshmen — and today, the freshmen themselves.

Third, tied in with my second point, is that I choose with some passion to consider myself a colleague among colleagues. If I have a wider area of responsibility than some of my colleagues, Peace. If I'm supposed sometimes to make unilateral decisions, after consultation, Peace. I am still a member of the faculty, with primarily administrative responsibility. The extent to which language from the world of business, in which the reason-for-being is to make honorable profit, and from the world of the military, in which the reason-for-being is "peace with honor" — the extent to which such language has permeated our administration of higher education, on a subliminally perceived level at best, is absolutely fatal unless we come to grips with its hidden dangers. For example, to read such a phrase as "The next superior administrative officer shall evaluate each faculty member . . .!"

Fourth, I believe we must treat the present budgetary squeeze as a critical incident, like a low-grade infection that comes to a head with a 104-degree temperature. A doctor cannot treat a low-degree infection well until it rises to a crisis. I believe that if we look on the squeeze in this way

it will seem a bit less nearly fatal, if we can relate to it as a critical incident to do some things that needed to be done long ago.

There is as much evidence around us of birth as of death. It's just very much easier to adopt the apocalyptic view, because that's the ultimate cop-out. Even though the apocalyptic view doesn't feel very good in the belly, it's easier by far than a kind of sturdy, resilient optimism.

Fifth, and my final contextual statement: I believe that however important the substance is of what we're talking about with each other, it is *not* the point. The really essential point is the dialogue going on — I'm talking about I-Thou dialogue in Martin Buber's sense, not mere debate, not mere chit-chat, not mere gathering and dispensing of information, but genuine dialogue where people relate to each other directly, post-Eric Berne, with his *Games People Play*, if you will. In order to establish the kind of give-and-take that must go on in a university — perhaps it has to go on in an army and in a business, but I'm not so sure — we have to assume a kind of crazy thing: that the substance of whatever we're doing is *not* the substance. It is a vehicle for our doing, well or poorly, what is the real substance: establishing dialogue with one or more others, in an I-Thou relationship.

I remember sitting in the first committee meeting I ever chaired after becoming an administrator, in which the topic of conversation was ostensibly whether a particular composition course was to carry two or three credits. And, after not more than five minutes, one of my senior colleagues was standing with a thick university catalog in his hand and another was saying, "Hit me! Hit me! I told you ten years ago, hit me!" To survive such an incident was to begin to learn how indestructible I am. It was also a negative *locus classicus* for me of my personal position: that whatever we're talking about is *not* the real point. The *real* point is whether we are mutually confirming our fellow-human-beingness, our bond as separate co-pilgrims; positively or negatively confirming, directly or tangentially. Believe me, I really keep this in mind when I'm talking with my colleagues, "reorienting and utilizing them" — as the title of this paper suggests.

An Administrator's Role in Changing Our Learning Environment

First, I believe we've got to persuade our colleagues of the necessity of being quasi-primitive in some experimental approaches to curricular planning. I'm aware that, on the one hand, any attempt to change is immediately a call for the accusation: "YOU'RE ABDICATING STANDARDS!" And I say, "You may be right." I'm aware of it, and indeed believe it's my responsibility to do that kind of exploring consciously, seeking to refine and relate to the results in a kind of curricular cybernetic mood. On the other hand, if choosing to be quasi-primitive can lead at least temporarily to a loss of traditional standards, *not* so choosing is almost certainly going to lead to staleness, *Abseitsmenschheit* — the experience of standing to one side in life — perhaps eventually to cynicism and despair.

Second, we've got to persuade colleagues that indestructible good-will and optimism are quite simply imperative. They are much tougher than their opposites. I've already said this, but I find it is such a central part of my survival mechanism that I want to stress it. One of the essential continuing difficulties we face — Donald Grout helped me learn, thank God, to distinguish between continuing difficulties and problems — is that we can't easily discern the glacial tempo of change. As I look back to where I was as a beginning college teacher, at the level of sleepingness that was in me, compared to the level that's in me now, change is quite clearly discernible. I really believe I'm a little bit more awake, twenty-five years later, and I have to keep concentrating on that every day as I get involved in the microrhythms, the brushfires of bureaucracy.

Third, like a Beethovenian coda written by Chaminade — I feel almost a passion to get down on my hands and knees and say, '*Please,* ladies and gentlemen, can we first of all exemplify?" Can we remember that we mainly help other people change, help them become less narrow, less fearful, if we exemplify it ourselves? For instance, if we as administrators don't behave musically, our goose is cooked, as far as I'm concerned; and we have few rewards as administrators to encourage us to behave musically. All I can say is: even if we only hum a Bulgarian dance-tune walking down the hallway, we've got to exemplify musicality and a lot of other such useful things. We've got to recognize that as the main way we help people change. We've got to exemplify by making music, by experiencing music, poems, films, essays—whatever we're involved in—life, if you will. We've got to exemplify by reflecting on experience and demonstrating that we believe reflecting is an essential feature of our life. There are many young people today who are so blown-out, defused, collapsed, by the emphasis on cognitive, verbal, quantifiable learning in the public-school system that by the time they get to us in a music course, they are likely to say, "Please, can't I just for one hour a week, just *experience* something?" And I say, "Yes, yes, yes; I only hope you're ready at a certain point to get involved in the reflective process." I keep trying to say to them that to "blow the mind" means to go beyond the mind and not stop short of it. We've got to exemplify a life-view that *we* feel good using.

And finally is this business of our having to be indestructible and of our having to have indestructible good-will even toward those with whom we disagree. One of the great releases of my life came when I learned that to wish your enemy well, in the great tradition of *Caritas,* didn't mean you had to *like* him. It means, "I wish you well, always, but maybe the less time we spend together, the better. . . ." As far as I'm concerned, such an image, such a filter for experience-in and experience-out, opens up an enormously wide path rather than the razor's edge of "I like you" or "I hate you." Between these two is a real highway, where I can really say, "My good-will is indestructible towards you — Peace."

THE ROLE OF THE MUSIC ADMINISTRATOR

EUGENE BONELLI

A successful music administrator combines the role of the musician with that of executive manager. To meet these dual responsibilities, two fundamental qualifications should be emphasized: (1) musical knowledge and abilities that will provide the necessary breadth for decision-making based on value judgments. (A music administrator is first and foremost a musician. His continuing need for music in his life and his exemplification of musicianship in his particular area of competence and interest provide an essential climate for the achievement of his own goals and those of his faculty and students.) And (2) organization and leadership skills, which should include a knowledge of behavorial science and technology for application to the management of change and the management of the music unit.

In order to provide a framework for this discussion, I would like to paraphrase a paragraph from a new book called *The Future Executive* written by Harland Cleveland, President of the University of Hawaii. "The core problem of the music administrator in a complex organization is to make the best possible choices: (1) whom to bring together, (2) in what type of organization, committee, etc., (3) to make what happen, and (4) whose interpretation of the public interest." This statement emphasizes the need for a mix of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values, and the capacity to utilize them in a synergistic way because he is actually making a million and one personal decisions, every day, around all of those choices.

The music administrator must ask himself the question, "For whom are you a steward?" The criteria against which he makes decisions are really personal choices around *his* values, how he sees his various constituencies (faculty, students, alumni, the entire university, the music profession at large, society at large), and into what rank order he puts them. The whole question of values is a key factor for any music executive in the decision-making process.

In the area of managerial skills, a music executive should have: (1) knowledge of people and their motivational systems — what makes them tick; (2) knowledge of organizations as social systems — what makes them effective and what makes them able to achieve; (3) a high degree of self-awareness and an ability to evaluate his own personal style and tendencies; and (4) knowledge of organizational processes such as decision making, planning, control, and communications.

In addition to qualities of musicianship and judgment, I would also like to focus on three additional characteristics which I consider vital: (1) a sense of enjoyment in the internalized rewards of the job; (2) a low need for public approbation — the ability to see his success in the achievements of faculty and students and in his role in making this possible; and (3) a high tolerance for ambiguity and complexity — a willingness to take risks

and live with the consequences. I believe a soft voice and a low-key manner are in the long run more effective in dealing with faculty and students. The old concept of the troops standing at attention is going out in terms of getting results. Right-Wrong attitudes are increasingly giving way to a high ability to listen as well as to talk — to receive consultation. A strong sense of optimism is a crucial corollary to the vital capacity of any music administrator to accept conflict and enjoy managing it. These qualities go hand-in-hand with skill in planning and goal setting and the ability to get at essential decisions.

Nothing is more frustrating to faculty and students than a conflict which is never resolved or the suggestions for curricular improvement which are never acted on, either positively or negatively. Warren Bennis, President of the University of Cincinnati, has formulated what he calls Bennis' Laws of Academic Pseudodynamics. The first is "Routine work drives out non-routine work," and the second, "Make whatever grand plans you will, you may be sure the unexpected or trivial will disturb and disrupt them." Any college administrator is increasingly aware of the potential for the routine and the trivial to smother to death all creative planning — the possibility of any fundamental change within a university or any of its schools and departments. The bureaucratic structure we have created for the high purpose of allowing various constituencies to be consulted in those decisions that affect them can then add up instead to a cave of the winds where the most that can usually be agreed upon is to maintain the status quo. The music administrator must find the way to rise above the routine, reach and implement essential fundamental decisions, and achieve a visibility in the decision-making process. Healthy faculty-student morale is dependent upon success in these areas. Particularly in this time of tight budgets, cut-backs, and constant change, these managerial skills are probably more essential for the music administrator than ever before.

In today's college or university, the realities of shared governance, whether formal or informal, dictate that we must have consensus for many of our decisions in order to get any really effective implementation. A music executive must get the commitment of large numbers of people or the job simply won't get done. Skill in conflict management and empathy with one's colleagues leads to a capacity to really get into other people's heads and to motivate various kinds and types of individuals. This is a very different way of thinking from the fair-but-firm and treat-everybody-the-same style, but I think the experience of many administrators points to the vital importance of the ability to achieve such motivation.

To be an effective leader, a music administrator must have not only a sense of purpose but some kind of relatively well-articulated picture of where he would like to be. Such a sense of purpose and direction is tied in with optimism, with planning, and with the psychological fact that one of the major characteristics of energy in motivation is some positive tension built into the system.

Let me turn for a moment to the use of the planning process in reorienting and utilizing faculty. One concept of planning holds that any organization should focus on achieving an accurate picture of the present before worrying about the future. There are many vehicles for the planning process — they run the gamut from the small ad hoc committee dealing with a specific problem with a curricular area to the opportunities provided by the NASM schoolwide self-survey as a component in the accreditation process. It is possible to clarify the demands of various constituencies if you have them represented in the planning process.

We must recognize the reality that universities are very complex organizations, including differing organizations for various units, joint appointments between various departments, and multiple reporting lines. I believe Toffler's concept of ad-hocracy can assist us in designing flexible ways to approach the planning process instead of insisting on standardization. I would encourage the music executive to focus on objectives and activities and then to design the planning process around these. Realizing that the ostensible objective of the process is often secondary to the interaction of people, an administrator can create new units in which faculty and students can relate in different ways. A new grouping of people can eliminate bureaucratic restrictions and create a situation where individual ideas have a chance to transcend the barriers of departmental organization and curricula.

Given the rate of change in all aspects of society today, I would encourage the use of short-term planning as a way to deal with the realities of the continuing changes in goals and objectives which are inevitable. Skillful use of the planning process can be vital in encouraging continuing faculty growth as an on-going process and in alleviating the fear which inhibits a willingness to take risks. The authority of the music administrator to organize a governance structure within the music unit can either be a millstone around his neck or a major asset in achieving his objectives.

In summary let me say that every music executive should regularly ask himself the question, "How much do I deal with people and how much with administrative convenience?" In his relationships with the faculty and students, the administrator does play a key role through his attitudes, example, style, and management abilities. His challenge is to creatively use faculty resources to the fullest. He must find ways to let faculty strengths play key roles while concurrently minimizing weaknesses which inevitably exist. This process is unique to each institution and can be a singularly creative and rewarding aspect of the music administrator's job. Every new faculty appointment or replacement is an opportunity to provide new resources relating to the goals which have been established for the music unit. The music administrator can broaden the perspectives of narrow faculty through (1) involvement in the planning process described above; (2) reports to the whole faculty by those attending professional meetings; and (3) the utilization of visiting professors and lecturers.

The music administrator does indeed play a key role in the use of faculty resources to meet student needs without prejudging those needs. He must be clear about the demands of his various constituencies and decide what he will do about them. He functions both as a musician and as an executive manager. In the combination of these two roles, I believe there is a real opportunity to take the initiative in what you want to do as well as a real chance of getting it done.

Discussion and Recommendations

All participants were assigned to one of four discussion groups, each with its own chairman and graduate student reporter. The participants felt that the topics that emerged and their related questions could become the basis for consideration by college faculty who wish to engage in discussions devoted to a re-evaluation of their own graduate music programs.

The following material presents under four main topics (1) questions and position statements that summarize the discussions and (2) recommendations that emanated from the four discussion groups.

1. An Expanded View of Specialization

Discussion

Do graduate students today need to be educated as specialists or generalists? Most individuals have the need to excel and assume they can do so only through a narrow specialization. But is it an either-or situation? Cannot a specialist be educated with a broad point of view? How important is it for an individual to view his specialty from a broader perspective? What is the relevance of other areas within a discipline to one's own specialty? Is a breadth of competence and interest necessary in order to accept change? How important is synthesis? Is it important to make relationships explicit so that students can synthesize the various components of their professional studies?

Recommendations

Expertise that is accompanied by breadth, versatility, flexibility, and openness are important characteristics for all graduate students; thus the recent NASM Statement on Basic Musicianship was felt by the Forum participants to be appropriate to all graduate as well as undergraduate study. Ideological separations among the various segments of a music department or school should be minimized, with pedagogy an acknowledged part of all disciplines.

Graduate programs should strive to develop a balance between depth in an area of specialization on the one hand and a breadth of competence on the other. To gain perspective of the music of their own culture, graduate students should be exposed to an expanded repertory that is representative of many musical styles and cultural values (including music outside Western culture).

Additional means for developing breadth in graduate students include providing opportunities for (1) intra- and interdisciplinary interaction among faculty and students, (2) teaching assignments and responsibilities that cross institutionalized, traditional boundaries, and (3) team teaching. A new system of rewards might acknowledge the contributions of those who are more generalists than specialists. Above all, to achieve breadth of competence as well as perspective, active communication is needed among faculty, administration, and students and among the various segments of the faculty.

2. Attitudes Toward Teaching

Discussion

The education of future college music teachers must begin not so much with graduate students as with present graduate school faculty and curricula. Thus, this discussion was concerned more with present college faculty as they influence future teachers.

Teaching must be recognized as a probable vocation for all graduate students, hence a commitment to the development of skills of communication is a needed component of graduate studies, particularly in the preparation of future college teachers. How can we place teaching in perspective to the total discipline, i.e., what is its relation to research, performance, composition, etc.? How does the authoritarian teaching found in many performance activities ("do as I do") affect teaching in other areas of the music curriculum?

Recommendations

The best way to learn to teach is to teach — under the supervision of master teachers. Problems of teaching are best presented for all graduate students in the context of direct teaching experiences with progressively deepening responsibilities: (1) through observation of model teachers working with music majors and general college students, (2) micro-teaching responsibilities under direct supervision, and (3) internship programs. Supervised teaching at the graduate level (1) should involve a variety of specialized concerns such as applied music study and music programs in community colleges, (2) can be initiated in special courses and seminars, and (3) can be implemented in graduate and undergraduate on-campus classes and through cooperative arrangements with community colleges and private music schools for off-campus teaching experiences. Most crucial, however, is improvement in the guidance and supervision of teaching assistants who have full or partial responsibility for undergraduate classes.

All graduate students should gain some understanding of present attitudes and trends related to the learning process and should develop competencies in establishing objectives and, in light of current thought and needs, effective teaching procedures, even if this requires study outside the field of music. In addition, they should develop efficient means for both

evaluation of student achievement and self-evaluation. Perhaps a graduate student could prepare, teach, and evaluate a course in his major field as part of his degree requirements.

One recommendation to improve the quality of teaching and to develop awareness of roles both as musicians and as teachers is to relate teaching techniques more explicitly to the students' music study, acknowledging that they in fact do absorb teaching qualities from the many different professors.

Policies should be established to recognize and reward good teaching, in addition to scholarship and publication. Grants might be awarded to individual faculty members to improve teaching, as an alternative or supplement to conducting research. Funds could be made available to faculty members for (1) equipment or materials to use directly in their teaching, (2) attending workshops, seminars or retreats devoted to the improvement of teaching, or (3) organizing on-campus meetings that involve outside consultants. And, finally, resources among neighboring institutions could be pooled to set up programs for the improvement of teaching.

The teaching assignments of graduate school faculty members should be redefined and periodically rotated in order to maintain a vital teaching-learning process. Other means to accomplish this might include faculty exchange, team teaching, the visiting of classes by other faculty members, and intradisciplinary teaching assignments.

---

3. Graduate Programs

Discussion

The evaluation of a graduate program should begin with the construction of a statement of beliefs based on an assessment of the place of both music and higher education in American society; it should define values in light of this statement, and define criteria for granting degrees. Institutional resources and their effects on enrollment should be described, with consideration given to a possible limitation to the size of graduate enrollments to match the job market.

Graduate programs should be flexible in order to accommodate changing needs, competencies, and desires of students. Stress should be placed on competencies, and when they are achieved, students should be released to develop their abilities in areas in which they are less proficient. Barriers to specialty changes between degree programs [e.g., performance (B.M.) to theory (M.M.)] should be removed. Excessive compartmentalization of interest (faculty and students) should be counteracted. Efforts must be exerted to expand the interests and competencies of faculty to meet changing needs.

Recommendations

As indicated previously, the NASM Statement on Basic Musicianship is appropriate as a guideline for all graduate study. Thus it was recom-

mended that a course of study be instituted for all graduate students, a study based on principles of a more comprehensive musicianship as suggested by this NASM Statement. This required core, which could be structured in a variety of ways, would continue to develop attitudes, knowledge, and competencies through experiences in the following:

1. Study of the basic repertory of Western art music and a wide variety of other styles, including music outside Western culture.
2. Performance.
3. Composition and improvisation.
4. Analysis and critical evaluation as related to performance, composition, and listening.
5. Communication/teaching.

A program such as this requires executive commitment and administrative support, and it might necessitate new units or departments which put together people of different specialties and persuasions. As in undergraduate studies, the pursuit of specialization continues simultaneously with efforts to develop breadth in perspective and expertise.

Finally, the need for student involvement in educational planning was stressed. College faculty were encouraged to listen to graduate students, to seek their input in matters related to curriculum, admissions, examinations, and teacher preparation.

---

4. Evaluation

Discussion

Disparities between what we teach and what we test should be avoided. Is evaluation more than testing alone? What new means are needed for successful evaluation procedures?

Admissions policies and procedures need to be re-evaluated and new indices found for measuring a student's potential for success. We need to learn more about a student before he is admitted to an institution.

Recommendations

Re-examine testing programs, particularly for admission to specialized programs in graduate schools, with special emphasis on remedial courses. A consistent and embracing policy is needed to control standards of testing, curriculum, and instruction. Prognostic and diagnostic testing of competencies should be conducted both periodically and terminally. Evaluation should be defined for the various musical roles:

1. Performance
2. Creative skills
3. Analytical-critical-historical studies
4. Pedagogical studies

SUMMARY

THOMAS W. MILLER, *Dean*
School of Music, Northwestern University

The Forum on the Graduate Education of College Music Teachers emphasized the need for forging a statement of philosophy and mission preliminary to the development of graduate curricula by all institutions. Only as its philosophy can be articulated and its resources assessed in relation to its goals for graduate education can an institution develop effective graduate programs. Thus an obligatory first step should be the development of a philosophy in keeping with the character of the institution and the profession.

The participants of the Forum were unanimous in their affirmation of the Basic Musicianship Statement by NASM and affirmed their support of that statement for all graduate programs. If the implications of that statement are to be realized at the undergraduate level, teachers educated in our graduate schools of music must experience curricula consistent with its intent. Specifically, the Forum recommended that graduate programs in music should require, in addition to a field of specialization, (1) a demonstrated understanding of the musical processes within a wide variety of music; (2) familiarity with a basic repertoire of Western Art music through performance, including performance practice, and analysis; (3) fluency in making evaluative judgments about music and conceptualizing about it as an æsthetic experience. Special emphasis was placed on the need for a *demonstrated competence in the teaching of music as a significant aspect of every graduate program in music.*

The discussions leading to these statements are indicative of the reasoning. Forum participants felt that there is a need to recognize the importance of excellence in teaching, particularly among students in the graduate schools. It is ironic that many college faculty do not exhibit pride in teaching as a profession even though evidence indicates that large numbers of musicians do teach, either full- or part-time; thus, teaching must be an important part of musicians' education.

In too many instances over-compartmentalization of faculty in the graduate schools leads to similar divisions among students. Professional segregation and over-compartmentalization are not just the result of individual preferences; they are also a product of schools which permit — even cultivate — a too narrow view of the discipline. Graduate faculties as a whole take pride in their narrow fields of specialization and therefore are highly resistant to change. This is in part due to a lack of rotation of teaching assignments within specialties and among various specialties. Barriers to student changes in specialization within graduate study are often enforced by highly specialized faculty. The problem requires a fundamental review of graduate admission procedures. The result of continuous highly

specialized teaching assignments frequently leads to authoritarian teaching and almost exclusive reliance on the traditional lecture method. Particular mention of the teaching of performance study as highly authoritarian recurred constantly in the discussions. A need for the continuation of performance during work on advanced scholarly degrees was strongly recommended. The Forum pointed out that ineffective evaluative techniques at the graduate level of study and among graduate faculty contributes to status quo programs which perpetuate themselves through graduates to other institutions.

Any reform of graduate curricula requires a high degree of administrative commitment to bring about new structures within music schools that allow for cross-disciplinary teaching by faculty and interdisciplinary programs for their students. The Forum participants underscored the necessity for establishing specific objectives for graduate programs and the development of evaluative criteria to measure their success as they relate to the total musicianly function as performer, scholar, composer and teacher.

The participants were explicit in their belief that meaningful reform in graduate education for the college music teacher can only be brought about through a systematic revitalization of existing graduate faculties to encourage an awareness of the profession's needs for genuinely prepared college teachers. Only as existing attitudes among graduate faculty change can significant progress in the quality of the education of future college music teachers be assured.